

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Food and Craving in Early Buddhist Monasticism focusing on Pali Literature

Kong, Man-Shik

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Food and Craving in Early Buddhist Monasticism
focusing on Pali Literature

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
King's College London (UNIVERSITY OF LONDON)

By MAN-SHIK KONG

2016

Abstract

This thesis examines the relationship between early Buddhist monastics and food; beliefs about food's function in the world; how food was regulated; and how Sangha practices responded to the social context and lay expectations of renunciators. I base my study on early Buddhist literature, mainly in Pali. I make extensive comparison between the six extant *vinaya*. I draw on the earliest layers of commentarial literature in Pali and Chinese. I explore how the relationship between Buddhist monastics and food changes, examining developments in selected Mahāyāna *sūtra*. Chapter One establishes key views on food by examining the cosmology of the *Aggañña Sutta*. This reveals that Buddhism accepts the practical need to eat for physical and spiritual health, but regards as problematic the craving for it, its production and its storage. I use understandings of anatomy to unravel the relationship made between food and lust. Chapter Two looks at the initial rejection of ascetic food restrictions by the Buddha, justifications for not eating after noon, reasons for permitting certain ascetic food restrictions, and narratives warning of the dangers of craving for food. Chapter Three is an indepth comparison of the *pācittiya* food rules and their origination stories in the six extant *vinaya*, examining how food gathering and acceptance was regulated in response to practical concerns including donor expectations of renunciators. Chapter Four looks at additional food rules for nuns that sought to avoid the transition of traditional female involvement in food preparation into the Sangha. Chapter Five examines meat and dairy products – the reasoning behind their inclusion in early Buddhism and their exclusion in some Mahāyāna texts. Chapter Six looks in detail at the radical difference in the meditation on the repulsiveness of food between its northern and Theravāda transmissions.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	4
List of Tables	7
Introduction	9
Chapter One: Early Buddhist Cosmology and the Nature of Food	40
Chapter Two: The Decision to Eat	81
Chapter Three: <i>Vinaya</i> Regulations concerning Food	125
Chapter Four: Additional Food Rules for Nuns	188
Chapter Five: Prohibited Foods	227
Chapter Six: Meditation Practices Related to Food	276
Conclusion	320
Abbreviations	334
Bibliography	336
Appendix	358

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my primary supervisor Prof. Kate Crosby for her extensive advice and help for my research and for my life in London. I thank her for the extensive hours that she put in to responding to and revising my writing, as well as furthering my research ideas. She broadened my academic horizons in relation to Theravāda Buddhism and other disciplines related to my research. I thank her for her attempts to train me in accuracy and deeper investigation. I especially thank for her patience and consideration for my research. I also greatly appreciate her warm-hearted treatment of my family, especially my two sons.

I similarly thank my secondary supervisor, Dr. Andrew Skilton, who took over after the departure of Prof. Xinzhong Yao for Renmin University. Dr. Skilton warmly helps foreign students, providing much useful advice on research work. He co-organised the Buddhist studies writers' forum at King's and I learnt many things about Ph.D. thesis work from him. Like Kate, he put in many hours improving my writing often at very short notice, particularly as the deadline for submission approached. I would not have been able to complete this thesis on time without him.

During my time as a Ph.D. student at SOAS and Kings, I also had the pleasure and benefit of knowing Dr. Pyi Phyto Kyaw, who always kindly answered my troublesome questions about academic and daily lives. She provided substantial help in all aspects of studying and living in the UK. She provided an excellent training session on academic referencing and offered guidance through the bureaucracy of submission. I also thank her for the way she treated my sons with great kindness and affection.

Two others have helped me behind the scenes: Piers Messum laboured on my articulation and English in the early days of my research studentship, while Richard

Arundel tackled my English writing towards the end, supporting my supervisors. I thank them both.

I wish to acknowledge my deep gratitude to Dr. Jung-Su Lee, who has always encouraged me throughout the difficulties of my life in a foreign country. He supports me in everything, whether in my academic or daily life. He was never reluctant to send me materials for my research from S. Korea, greatly facilitating my research. I would similarly like to express my gratitude to Dr. Ja-rang Lee for her useful advice for my research. She readily helped me whenever I asked, especially when I asked for Japanese materials for my research.

I thank the Temple Food Division of the Jogye Order for giving me useful information and materials for my research in spite of my continuing criticism of its direction and activities. I also thank the staff at the Temple Food Division for supporting and helping my research, especially You-Shin Kim and So-Young Choi for their endless support and help.

I greatly thank the Korean nuns who are temple food experts for their kindness and useful information on temple food, especially Bhikkhuni Hong Seung, who helped my research on temple food, telling me invaluable stories and providing useful information about the history of Korean temple food; also Bhikkhuni Bup Song, who greatly encouraged my research on temple food.

My two examiners Prof. Koichi Shinohara of Yale and Prof. Paul Dundas of Edinburgh showed extraordinary diligence, patience and kindness in their examination of my thesis and the *viva voce* examination, which they also conducted with great efficiency only a month after submission. I would like to apologise to them for any shortcomings in my attempts to correct the thesis in accordance with their suggestions or for failing to understand any of the points they made in the viva. I could not have hoped for more informed or considerate examiners.

Finally, but most importantly, I thank my family. I owe many things to my parents in law, Kuk-Eung Chang and Hyun-Ja Yang. They have supported me for everything in studying and living in London. I am greatly indebted to my wife and two sons who must have endured lonely and boring times without their husband and father. I am greatly grateful to my wife, You-jean Jang, who has supported and has dealt with every problem caused in daily life both without and by her husband. I thank all three for accompanying me here to London. I think I should pay my greatest gratitude to my mother who has sacrificed everything for me and continues to do so even now. My thanks to all those I mention here, for enabling me to complete this research. I appreciate for their help and affection wholeheartedly.

Man-Shik Kong,
King's College London,
September 2015.

List of Tables

1.1. The Eighteen Elements.	43
1.2. The classification of the state of food in the <i>Aggañña sutta</i>	48
1.3. The classification of food in the <i>Apidamo shunzhengli lun</i>	49
1.4. The classification of food in the <i>Yuqie shidi lun</i>	50
1.5. the Classification of food in the <i>Quishi jing</i> (起世經).	52
1.6. The relationship between human beings and nature in the <i>Sāmmittiya</i>	57
1.7. Immorality and decrease of life span.	59
2.1. The Buddha-to-be's ascetic practices relating to food.	69
2.2. Ascetic practice concerning food seen in the <i>Jātaka</i>	82
2.3. The perils of food in the <i>Jātakas</i>	90
2.4. Four reasons which monks abandon their monasticism.	92
2.5. Three types of gluttony.	93
3.1. <i>Bhikkhu</i> rules related to food in the <i>pātimokkha</i>	101
3.2. <i>Bhikkhuni</i> rules related to food in the <i>pātimokkha</i>	101
3.3. The five kinds of foodstuffs defined by the five major Buddhist <i>vinaya</i>	107
3.4. Sumptuous food items which are defined in the five major Buddhist <i>vinaya</i>	128
3.5. The difference between the Five Offerings in Buddhist and Brahmanic.	138
4.1. Unshared food rules for nuns.	149
4.2. Pungent and other vegetables prohibited in the four <i>Dharmasūtra</i>	154
4.3. Prohibited vegetables in the <i>Manusmṛti</i> and the <i>Yājñavalkyasmṛti</i>	155
4.4. Classification of <i>pācittiya</i> and countermeasure rules on garlic.	159
4.5. Sumptuous food items in the nun <i>pāṭidesaniyā</i> rules of five <i>vinaya</i>	175
4.6. Gastronomic foodstuffs in five <i>vinaya</i>	177
5.1. Meats prohibited by major Buddhist <i>vinayas</i>	195
5.2. Examples of consuming meat or foodstuffs relating to meat in Pali <i>Vinaya</i>	209
5.3. Kinds of meat prohibited in Pali <i>vinaya</i> and the <i>Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra</i>	213
6.1. Types of and the benefits of the <i>saññā</i> in various Buddhist texts.	223

6.2. Repulsive aspects of material food in the *Vimuttimaggā* and the *Visuddhimagga*.236

Introduction

This thesis examines the relationship between early Buddhist monastics and food; how that relationship was regulated and understood; how it reflected early Buddhist beliefs about the world; and how it responded to the social context of the time. I base my study on early Buddhist literature, mainly the Pali canon, using both *sutta* and *vinaya* sources. I do extensive comparison between the Theravada *vinaya* and other *vinaya* extant in Chinese. I also draw on the earliest layers of commentarial literature in Pali and on commentarial literature in Chinese. In order to explore how the relationship between early Buddhist monastics and food changes, I also explore developments attested within early Mahāyāna *sūtra*. Below I shall explain the focus of my thesis, the texts used and the approach I have taken more fully. Firstly, however, I would like to explain why I, a non-monastic from South Korea, became so interested in this subject.

My interest in the topic of food in Buddhist monasticism

My primary motivation for research on food stems from an earlier health problem which meant that I had to change my dietary habit completely from a mainly meat based diet to a vegetarian one. This led me to switch my academic interest from Buddhist doctrine to Buddhist approaches to food. From reading books on vegetarian diets, I became interested in Buddhist temple food. I had been vaguely aware of the topic before, because Korean Buddhist lay people such as myself are aware that Buddhist monks and nuns in Korea should be vegetarian, but I had never been interested in finding out more before this. My reading on temple food in Korea made me realize that there was only a meagre amount of well-informed or academic writing

on temple food. For even though monks and nuns in *Seon* (禪)¹-dominated Korean Buddhism frequently mention the proposition that “eating is a religious practice,”² the tradition does not seem to have any detailed explanations about Buddhist practices of consuming and excluding particular foods.

I found the meagreness of literature on temple food in S. Korea to be predominantly on the theoretical side. There are many materials on temple food in Korea that provide recipes. These sometimes include limited theoretical explanations based on the authority of some Mahāyāna sūtra, such as the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* and the *Mahāyāna Brahmajāla Sūtra*. These texts do indeed prohibit eating meat and the five pungent vegetables, namely, garlic, spring onion, chives, wild chives and asafoetida. They justify such a stance on two basic grounds: compassion and the avoidance of exciting passions unwelcome in monasticism: anger and sexual desire. (In this thesis, I shall turn to these texts and topics in Chapter Four, where I look at pungent vegetables under additional rules for nuns, and Chapter Five, where I look at the variable regulation of eating meat and dairy in Buddhist texts.) In spite of reference to this tradition and literature, and the significance of temple food in S. Korean Buddhist culture, no substantial academic investigation into Korean temple food has been undertaken so far. When I sought material further afield, I found that this subject has received relatively little attention in scholarship more broadly, with – as far as I am aware – no dedicated monograph on food in early Buddhism or Buddhist history in the languages available to me (Korean, Chinese, Japanese, English), a picture confirmed by Patrick Olivelle in his articles that deal with early Indian renouncer attitudes to food (see Chapters One and Two).

¹ The Jogye Order has officially used the pronunciation, *Seon* (禪), for Zen. See Jogye Order official website, <http://www.koreanbuddhism.net/>

² This seems to come from the thought of Chinese Chan master, Mazu, who advocated 'daily life is religious practice.'

My interest in Buddhist food is not an isolated interest. There is now a growing interest in the topic in S. Korea, partly in relation to the position of temple food in Korean culture and partly in relation to the way government funding is distributed at present. Temple food began to be popularized by Buddhist nuns in the early 2000s and Buddhist institutes for temple food, established mainly by Buddhist nuns, have been actively developing recipes for temple food. Interestingly, food as a potential source of revenue and means of serving the community for Buddhist nuns goes back to early Buddhism, as we shall see in Chapter Four. At present, there are roughly ten famous temple food experts, mostly Buddhist nuns. Among them, two nuns are particularly well known. Their interests relating to temple food are mostly the recipes and spreading of temple food into secular society. One of the two nuns, Dae-an Bhikkhuni, is doing a Ph.D course at Dongguk University majoring in temple food and the introduction of temple food into society. Another nun, Sunjae, has opened a private institute for temple food and invented a new menu. However, their explanations regarding the theoretical basis for temple food are restricted to a rudimentary level of knowledge derived from a few Mahāyāna texts, on the Buddhist side, and on a limited area of Chinese medicine, on the medical side.³

On 15th July, 2004, the Jogye Order, the dominant Buddhist tradition in Korea, established the ‘Cultural Corps of Korean Buddhism’ and included a “Temple Food Division” within it. There are four projects currently running at the Temple Food Division⁴ of the Jogye Order. These are: 1) globalization, which aims to promote Korean food around the world particularly at the commercial level; 2) research and

³ These two *bhikkhuni* have published some books on temple food in Korean, mostly recipes for temple food. Bhikkhuni Dae-an has published books such as *Temple Dining Table* (Jan, 2010) and *Meditation on a Dining Table* (April, 2008); Bhikkhuni Sunjae, *Temple Food with Stories* (May, 2011) and *Temple Food by* (May, 2005).

⁴ The Temple Food Division is an administrative department of the Jogye Order, and the Research Group of Korean Temple Food belongs to this Temple food Division.

surveying, which gathers and analyses data about existing temple food practices in S. Korea, and plans to expand into research on texts relevant to temple food; 3) popularization, which aims to promote the consumption of Korean temple food by the general populace in S. Korea mainly through supporting the opening of more temple food restaurants and promoting temple food cookery classes; and 4) marketing, which aims to hire marketing experts and entrust them with promoting temple food.

The Temple Food Division has at present six dedicated staff, but the head of the division for temple food informed me (conversation, 2nd September 2011) that the division plans to increase the number of staff and to develop the academic understanding of and research into temple food at an increasingly sophisticated level. They are doing this through their research and surveying project. They are also commissioning and inviting research and asked me (email, 6th September 2011), for example, to look into the attitudes towards garlic in early and pre-modern Indian Buddhist texts as one of their projects. The same division is also planning to establish an institute for temple food⁵ and to commission a textbook for educating people about the theoretical aspects of temple food.⁶ The same division is also planning to establish an institute for temple food and to commission a textbook for educating people about the theoretical aspects of temple food.⁷

The globalization project works closely with the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism in their efforts to promote Korean business. At a cultural event put on in France promoting Korean Buddhist culture from 28th to 30th September 2011 in Paris

⁵ This Institute will research temple food in two separate categories, an Indian and a Chinese division. In the Indian division, the origin of Buddhist views towards food from mainly Theravāda and Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism will be explored, and in the Chinese division, the attitude to food in Zen works is to be investigated.

⁶ Conversation with the Head of the Temple Food Division, Yusin Kim, (5th, Oct, 2011).

⁷ The division has commissioned the project with Geumkang University to research ancient Korean literature on temple food. Early this year, it held a temple food conference titled “Academic Forum on Temple Food” on 14th March 2015. Accessed at <http://www.koreatemplefood.com/upload/2015/4/30//bdfe4f2b62f53da5e725e3765e5bf742.pdf> on 20th Sep, 2015.

included the promotion of Korean temple food. The delegation for temple food invited celebrities in Paris and provided them with a chance to taste Korean temple food. Finally, at the present stage, the popularization project is focused on building an English internet site for temple food.⁸

The Jogye Order's research body, the 'Research Group of Korean Temple Food', was launched two years earlier in 2009. It aimed to survey Korean temple food at almost all of the temples in S. Korea, conducting quantitative research. Within the first two years, they had surveyed temple foods in Chungchung province located in the middle of S. Korea, publishing a book of the results.⁹ They then undertook surveying temple food in Kyungsang province, in the southeast. The results from this province may prove particularly interesting because this is the province where Buddhism flourishes most in S. Korea.¹⁰ They then undertook a temple food survey in Kyungsang province, in the southeast. Now the research is underway in Gangwon and Jeju provinces (2015). We could obtain nation-wide information on temple food after the 2015 survey of temple food. Every year the survey results are published.

International activities relating to food organised by the Jogye Order, such as the food festivals held in New York in 2010 and Paris in 2011, are substantially supported by the Korean government as part of its interest in promoting Korean culture and industry. The main financial source derives from the budget of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of S. Korea. Previously, in 1988, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, had decided to support temple-staying in the expectation that this would resolve the potentially serious accommodation shortage caused by the 1988

⁸ Conversation with Yusin Kim, 2nd Sep, 2011.

⁹ Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, *Pilgrimage for Temple Food Purifying Body and Mind*, 2010.

¹⁰ Statistics Korea pronounces that as of 2005, the distribution of the three major religions in Kyungsang province is as follows: Buddhism (22.8%), Christianity (18.3%) and Catholicism (10, 9%). The percentage of Buddhism in Kyungsang province is much higher than other provinces in Korea. See <http://kostat.go.kr/portal/korea/index.action>.

Seoul Olympics by creating tourist accommodation in the temple sector. While the impact at the time was limited, it initiated the now popular practice of non-monastics staying temporarily in temples. In 2011, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism decided to make money available for cultural business and tourism in the Jogye Order. Within the budget of 12,200,000,000 Korean Won (10,472,103, USD as of 13th, Sep, 2011), a sum of 1,500,000,000 Korean Won (1,287,553 USD as of 25th, Nov, 2011) was allocated to temple food.¹¹

It may be seen from that this that while I became interested in this subject for health reasons, I am part of the broadening consumer group for temple food. My position in this trend notwithstanding, I would suggest that the current promotion of temple food in the ways described above poses some problems, which I shall now identify. First of all, discussion of spirituality and attitudes to food in Buddhism is, in my view, a fundamental aspect of temple food, yet it does not occupy a prominent place as a priority in the process of spreading temple food as a product. Rather the emphasis is on the taste or health benefits of the food in question. In connection with the focus on increasing the secular popularity of temple food, it is not only the taste but also the appearance that is enhanced to make the food more attractive to consumers. Thus the look of temple food is already becoming more decorative and colourful. This is also linked to it being sold at an excessively high price. In this attempt to broaden the appeal, and in pricing it so highly, there is the loss of moderation implicit in traditional temple food. As we shall see in Chapter Three, early Buddhism specifically prohibited the pursuit of food based on taste or variety, both of

¹¹ For the budget, see the website of the Minister of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Budget for Temple Stay (which includes Budget for Temple Food Temple food budget)

2009 18,500,000,000 Won 1,500,000,000 Won

2010 18,500,000,000 Won 1,500,000,000 Won

2011 12,500,000,000 Won 1,500,000,000 Won

<http://www.mcst.go.kr/web/dataCourt/budgetData/budgetDataView.jsp>

which factors are now proven within the modern field of food psychology to promote appetite rather than maximise a sense of satisfaction.¹² The emphasis on appealing to the taste, entertaining aesthetics and claiming health benefits is all about the pursuit of profit, in my view, rather than about enhancing the consumer's health, and thus loses the intention, simplicity and health benefits of the original product.

Another problem in relation to the increased popularity and emphasis on temple food is that it puts people in a position of theorizing about it when there is a vacuum in the research findings available. Thus relative novices to the theory of temple food put forward theories and ideas that are incorrect or ill-founded. I see examples of this in the collection of conference papers on the temple food which the Jogye Order held for the first time on 20th November 2010. It reveals that the presenters lacked the appropriate background knowledge and expertise to deliver accurate information or findings about temple food. For example, one paper insists that the views concerning the five pungent vegetables were actually derived from Taoism in China,¹³ whereas, as I shall show in my thesis, they are already mentioned in Indian Buddhist texts (Chapter Four), and there is no reason why the origin of the discussion of them should be drawn from Taoism.

My concerns about these developments led me to be interested in the significance of food in early Buddhist monasticism. I wanted to know what aspects were emphasised: what spiritual, physical, visual and taste priorities do we find in early Buddhism, and how far can we see the differences later found in East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhism while it was still developing in India? The reason I chose to look at Theravāda Buddhist texts as representative of Buddhism during its earlier development in South Asia, is that this enables me to separate the Indian and

¹² See, e.g. Stevenson 2009.

¹³ The five pungent vegetables are already mentioned in Indian Buddhist texts and there are no reasons why the origin of the five pungent vegetables should be drawn from the Taoism.

Buddhist influence on later East Asian Buddhism from the influences coming from the religions and culture of East Asia itself, i.e. from Taoism, Confucianism, Chinese medicine, etc. Nonetheless, I have also drawn on Chinese texts including the various *vinaya* in order both to pinpoint the same values in those texts which informed East Asian Mahāyāna, and to find evidence for moves towards the exclusion of certain foods, some of which do reflect cultural differences (see e.g. my discussion of the use of dairy in Chapter Five).

In order to solve or improve the problems inherent in the current promotion of temple food, I suggest that the following could be considered. We should improve the level of Buddhist knowledge concerning food to make sure that we transmit correct Buddhist views and information to people. Buddhist principles and attitudes to food in early Buddhism should play a pivotal role in informing society about temple food. This is not only to cultivate desirable attitudes to food in people, but also to make them realize the inevitable connection between mind and food. This could improve the impact of some of the famous ‘food nuns’ in guiding their audience, since attitude is a crucial aspect in people’s choice of what they eat.

On a practical level in relation to the spreading of temple food, I think that it would be desirable to separate lay and monastic cooking, selling and marketing of temple food. Temple food by lay people could be more society-oriented, with an emphasis on secular values, allowing monastics to be more loyal to Buddhist doctrine and precepts, and less influenced by commercial concerns.

The research that I have undertaken for this thesis aims at making a meaningful contribution to the developments I suggested above. I intend to correct misunderstandings concerning Buddhist food in relation to temple food in S. Korea. While it may have no immediate, direct, practical effect, I hope my thesis will

contribute to the discussions about food theory in Korea, as well as elsewhere, which in turn may be of practical benefit.

I have so far focused my discussion on the S. Korean context for my interest in Buddhist food. Why then, is my thesis not on Korean or even East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhist food, but primarily focused on the early period of Buddhism, mainly in South Asia before and towards the early centuries of its spread to East Asia? The practice of East Asian monasticism in relation to food is markedly different from that of both South Asian and Central Asian Buddhism, in relation to the distinctive meat-eating of both the latter and the rule of only eating before noon in the former. I mentioned above errors made in attributing East Asian practice to non-Buddhist sources. In spite of the significance of Indian Buddhism as the origin of all other forms, the importance of Indian Buddhist texts, in particular monastic codes, *vinaya*, has been comparatively devalued in the discussion of temple food in S. Korea. The discussion has emphasised rather the detailed monastic code, "Pure Regulations", composed in Tang dynasty in China and used in revised versions at monasteries in East Asia afterwards.¹⁴ Although "Pure Regulation" works are fundamentally based on Buddhist *vinaya* texts from India, they were composed for the Chinese monastic context. In discussions of temple food in Korea, this continuity between Indian and East Asian has been ignored or underplayed. The difference between the two has been emphasized, rather than their similarity. As a result, discussions of temple food have reproduced common misunderstandings of Theravāda Buddhism as fundamentally different or even as a heterodox form of Buddhism.

¹⁴ The "Pure Regulation (清規)" was composed in Tang dynasty in China by Zen master, Baizhang Huai-Hai, and was entitled *Baizhang Qinggui*, but this work lost. The extant "Pure Regulation" was written by Zen master, Zong-ze and this Regulation has been revised by Zen master, De-Hui in Yuan dynasty in China. The Pure Regulation entitled the *Chixiu Baizhang Qinggui* by De-Hui is most frequently used for research for the life of the monastery. Please note that I use the Japanese term "Zen" as the generic term for the Chan, Zen and Seon traditions.

The conference on Temple Food held by the Jogye Order on 20th November 2010 in Seoul showed the current level of discussion at the point when I was setting out on my research into this topic. Firstly, texts for researching Temple Food are mainly Chan/Zen/Seon works, particularly, "Pure Regulations" (detailed regulation for Zen monastic lives, 清規) and Mahāyāna texts such as the *Mahāyāna Brahmajāla Sūtra*, the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*. In my thesis I do not use the Pure Regulations, but I shall refer to these *sūtra*, primarily to show their difference from all *vinaya* in the matter of eating animal products (primarily Chapter Five). In addition to these texts, speakers at that conference did mention the Theravāda *vinaya* and the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, but much less frequently than they mentioned the Pure Regulations. Therefore I realised I should look at the earliest layers of Buddhist texts, especially the *vinaya*, and the pre- and non-Mahāyāna commentarial layer, in order to extend the scope of Buddhist texts which form the basis for our understanding of Buddhist food practice. I should then use that basis to begin to look at the evidence of Mahāyāna sources.

The significance of food in Buddhist history

The approach of early Buddhism to food is contained in some of its foundational myths. The Buddha's acceptance of the meal from Sujātā, discarding his former asceticism, is a turning point, the physical and mental benefits of doing so crucial for his enlightenment, as we shall see in Chapter 2. The gathering of food, the beginning of the alms round, forms an essential part of the establishment of the Buddhist monastic community (Sangha) at the Buddha's first sermon, when – after his enlightenment – he returned to his five former companions in the deer park. In rejecting the asceticism that he and his companions had formerly pursued, the

Buddha and early Sangha promoted the ‘Middle Way’ between extreme asceticism and indulgence. In order to maintain the optimum physical and mental condition to achieve enlightenment, his disciples who renounced the world would not try to avoid food, rather they would partake of food in moderation.¹⁵ They therefore went on alms rounds, receiving gifts of food into their alms bowl from lay people who thereby made merit. This practice followed the established ancient Indian religious practice of supporting wandering renouncers. The name for monks, *bhikkhu* (Sanskrit *bhikṣu*) ‘one who desires/receives a share’, is a desiderative adjective derived from the verbal root *bhaj* ‘to share.’¹⁶ The nuns who later joined the Saṅgha were called by the female equivalent, *bhikkhunī*. An alms bowl for receiving food was one of the 4/8 requisites needed – and to this day still needs – to receive ordination into the Buddhist Sangha.¹⁷ Other forms of receiving food developed on different occasions, as will be seen in the discussion of *vinaya* (Chapters Three to Five). We also find differences within different traditions, such as the presence of kitchens in monasteries. This development was perhaps most significant in East Asia, where begging was culturally alien and a sign of low status, and may have contributed to other developments, such as vegetarianism among monastics. While Theravāda monasteries also often contain kitchens, the focus on the alms round continues to this day. In some places, such as Burma, Laos and Cambodia, it remains a primary practice for many monks, for at least one of the two daily meals (breakfast and lunch) permitted for novices and fully ordained monks and

¹⁵ The Buddha states in the *Mahāsihanāda Sutta* that he could not obtain any insight or wholesome state for obtaining religious ideals through his ascetic practices, (M I. 81). Furthermore, in the *Mahāsaccaka Sutta* he says that he regains his strength to enter meditative state for *jhāna* (M I. 247). In the *Mahāsakuludāyī Sutta*, the Buddha mentions that if his disciples respect him because he consumes a little food, then they should stop revering him since he eats a full bowl of almsfood or even more (M II. 7). See Chapter Two.

¹⁶ PED 496.

¹⁷ The Buddhist texts define the two kinds, 4 or 8, of the requisites (*parikkhārā*) for monks:

A. 4 requisites: robe, alms-bowl, seat and bed and medicine (V III. 132; D III. 268).

B. 8 requisites: an inner robe, an outer robe, a thick double robe, the bowl, a razor, a needle, the girdle and a water-strainer (J IV. 342).

nuns.¹⁸ In other places, such as monasteries in Sri Lanka, it is mainly followed on ceremonial occasions, and by special request, since it is regarded as aesthetically pleasing and particularly meritorious.

The reliance of the Sangha on food had a number of consequences. It affirmed that monks and nuns should eat food, thereby placing the monastics at risk of the attendant dangers, particularly those associated with ‘greed (*lobha*)’, one of the three ‘fires’ that keep us trapped in the cycle of *saṃsāra*, and ‘craving (*taṇhā*)’.¹⁹ We can see the ideal attitude to food on the part of monks reinforced in various standard formulae, such as this one which describes a monk’s relation to food:

“Monks observe Buddhist virtues firmly, control sense organs, comprehend moderation in eating and establish mindfulness” (AN II. 40)²⁰

The ideal of partaking of food without experiencing craving or other attendant vices such as – as we shall see in the course of the thesis – rivalry for status, anger and even lust, is supported by another foundational myth in the canon, the *Aggañña Sutta*, which relates the decline of the universe and the arising of multiple vices to acting on craving and other negative responses to food and food storage (see Chapter One). Since the Sangha eschewed the production and storage of food, yet still maintained regular eating habits, it relied on lay people for the provision of food. This decision defined the relationship between the Sangha and lay society, thereby placing the Sangha at risk of the attendant dangers of becoming overly close with the lay society and values they were meant to have renounced, and also of disappointing their supporters in the ways they behaved in relation to receiving food. As we shall see, themes relating to these dangers and the need to accommodate lay expectations of

¹⁸ In practice, especially in Cambodia, people may in fact donate some money into the monk’s shoulder bag rather than food into the bowl.

¹⁹ AN. IV. p. 96; It. 83; 84.

²⁰ *Sīle patiṭṭhito bhikkhu indriyesu ca saṃvuto Bhojanamhi ca mattaññū jāgariyaṃ anuyuñjati.*

renouncers, shaped food-related narratives and regulations (Chapters Two and Three respectively).

Chapter One establishes some of the key principles in relation to food by examining the narrative of the *Aggañña Sutta*. We see how the myth makes sense in terms of cosmological, medical and psychological understandings of early Buddhism, so that Buddhism accepts the practical need of eating for survival while at the same time regarding responses to it, and the production and storage of it deeply problematic. We see how strongly this *sutta* offers a model for ideal behaviours for Buddhist renouncers and how specific aspects relate closely to specific *vinaya* rules. This chapter both builds on previous work by Patrick Olivelle and Steven Collins in relation to the *Aggañña Sutta*²¹ and adds new insights on the specifics of the cosmological narrative, in particular by examining commentarial period medical understandings of the relationship between eating and sexual organs, in order to understand the relationship between greed for food and lust presented without detailed explanation in the text.

The rest of my thesis deals more closely with the ways in which early Buddhism managed the dangers inherent in food and its negotiation with lay expectations. The *Aggañña Sutta* takes us into Chapter Two as we examine the significance of its cosmogony in supporting the acceptance of food. We examine the reasons given by the Buddha for accepting food, the lower status of ascetic practices in Buddhism but the inclusion of some such practices specifically for those who, unlike the Buddha, are not beyond craving. I provide a detailed comparison of the permitted ascetic practices related to food from multiple *vinaya* and commentarial sources. We also see how the practice of not eating after noon, which might be interpreted as an accommodation to lay expectations of renouncer behaviour, was

²¹ It also accepts some of the perspective of Richard Gombrich, but benefits more from the insights of Olivelle and Collins.

justified as a practice for all monks, nuns and novices on the basis of practical considerations. These considerations relate to health, physical safety, saving time and maintaining an appropriate distance from the dangers and attractions of lay life. I touch on the continued emphasis on the importance of moderation in eating, avoiding both extremes, in support of meditation and on the basis of medical understanding, in later Buddhist literature including texts composed in China.

In Chapter Three we look at the specific rules found in the *Suttavibhaṅga* of the Pali *Vinaya Piṭaka* and its counterparts (the other five extant *vinaya*, see below). In addition to presenting the rules themselves I look at the different narratives that the texts provide for the establishment of the rules and analyse these to see what they tell us about the reasons for the rules. I note the significance of the “Group of Six” monks in most of these origination narratives. They often provide comical exemplification of what can go wrong if monks do not adhere to appropriate behaviour.

The main rules on food occur in the *pācittiya* and *sekhiya* sections of the *vinaya*, and as such are relatively minor. Yet they tell us a great deal about how early Buddhism developed its relationship with the lay community. While the *pācittiya* apply to monks, the 75 rules of training also apply to novices and are important in the development of appropriate decorum. While most of the chapter deals with rules that are found in the *pācittiya* section of the *vinaya* rules, which mostly relate to the acquisition of food, I also summarise the 75 *sekhiya* rules. The *sekhiya* rules mainly relate to the way in which food should be eaten, once it has been acquired. Both sections reveal an early acceptance of eating ‘by invitation’ rather than only by alms-round, a picture confirmed in many *sutta* texts. The comparison of rules between the different *vinaya* (see below on sources) allows us to see, in this and more so in later chapters, how developments in monastic food culture between the three surviving *vinaya* lineages of Buddhism, Dharmaguptaka, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Theravāda

leading to quite different practices in the geographical regions of East, Central and Southeast Asia respectively, relate to historical developments.

While Chapter Three focused on rules for monks, which also apply to nuns, in Chapter Four I look specifically at the additional rules for nuns, many of which in fact turn up in the *Mahāvagga* and its equivalents, and so apply to monks also but as lesser infringements. While I look at the substances and actions prohibited for nuns in their own right, my main conclusion in Chapter Four is that the additional rules for nuns, while indicating prejudicial attitudes against women, also reveal a deeper concern that renunciators should eschew food storage and preparation that takes us back to our findings from the *Aggañña Sutta* noted in Chapters One and Two. It would seem from the origination narratives for these extra rules that the additional rules for nuns seek to minimise the transition of lay practices into the renouncer realm. Since women dominated the final stages in the production of food, namely cooking, within lay society, they were at particular risk of maintaining such habits after joining the Sangha.

As I mentioned, some of the prohibitions on nuns also apply to monks, but are not found among the *pāṭimokkha* rules. To examine them, I turn in Chapter Five of this thesis, to the *Bhesajjakhandha*, the medicine section of the *Mahāvagga*, which prohibits certain types of food. It is here that we see the clearest origins of the rules on five pungent vegetables as well as the prohibition of certain types of meat. This implies the allowance of meat and fish in the diet of early Buddhist monastics, a position affirmed by the list of appropriate medicines, permitted sumptuous food, and by the establishment of a principle by which meat could be eaten, if pure in three ways. I examine these texts in detail, and also note the beginnings of divergences in the different *vinaya*. I relate the notions of purity and impurity to earlier and contemporaneous Hindu and – to a lesser extent – Jain texts. I compare lists of

prohibited food items. I thus note that the *vinaya* appear to reflect developing food and purity concerns found within Indian society more generally as these altered historically. Since Chapter Five concerns the allowance of meat and fish and the prohibition on certain meats and vegetables in the various *vinayas*, it is in this chapter that I look at how different Mahāyāna *sūtra* prohibits the consumption of meat. Contrary to popular opinion the prohibition of meat in them is not primarily concerned with compassion, although this is an emergent theme in the texts. I notice that we find in Mahāyāna *sūtra* different attitudes to the consumption of dairy products, and speculate that these may relate to the place of composition of the relevant *sūtra*. While texts composed in India affirm the consumption of dairy products, include them on the list of sumptuous foods and appropriate medicines, some that may have been composed in China reject dairy consumption, reflecting disgust towards dairy products and assumptions regarding health in China as well as compassion in the context of different farming methods in the two regions. The texts mention practices familiar to us from modern dairy farming: the over production of calves and their slaughter to ensure continuous milk supplies from cows, practices eschewed in India on the basis of the sanctity of the cow, a concept that appears to have developed relatively early on the subcontinent.

In reality the content of Chapter Five is the most relevant to the differences between East Asian monastic practices and those found elsewhere in relation to food, and the topics warranted a thesis in their own right. However, as I hope will become apparent, it would have been impossible to start with those topics without first providing the material found in the preceding chapters. Finally, Chapter Six might also warrant a work in its own right. For while the *vinaya* rules sought to govern monastic practice in relation to food, which would have in turn had a significant impact on the attitudes of many monks to food, there are meditation practices in

Buddhism which seek to shape those attitudes directly. In Chapter Six I examine these, focusing mostly on the *āhāre paṭikūlasaññā* practices. These practices inculcate the ‘perception of loathsomeness in respect of food’. Fascinatingly the Theravāda teachings on this subject differ radically from those found in Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna writings on the subject. The latter group imposes what might be regarded as a somewhat artificial understanding of *asubha*, impurity or foulness, on food, such that the practitioner must see as impure food which is not yet contaminated, whereas the Theravāda practices focus on actual sources of contamination and the trials and tribulations entailed in going on an alms-round. Because of the obesity epidemic around the developed world, such artificial impositions of negative responses towards food are of interest to modern food psychology, a rapidly growing subject. As documented by Stevenson, negative attitudes to food that do not relate to actual dangers (such as mould, for example) can indeed be learnt. I would like to have developed this topic further, using modern food psychology, for it is possible that just as mindfulness practices have been applied beyond Buddhism, food-related meditations based on Buddhist precursors may be of use in treating obesity. However, such considerations have had to be left to another occasion or another scholar, and I have focused on documenting the different versions of these practices in the texts that I have studied.

Literature review

I mentioned above that there has to my knowledge been no monograph dedicated to the topic of food in early Buddhism. However, some food related themes have been the focus of previous scholarship and I wish to note such discussions here, including some that have proved useful for this study, although I shall not pre-empt

my use of the work of Olivelle and Collins, since I discuss their work in detail in Chapters One and Two. Due to linguistic constraints, I shall only be reviewing scholarship that has been published in English, Japanese and Korean. The fact that there has been more written in Japanese than in English reflects the focus in East Asian Buddhism on food regulations for monastics.

Environment/cosmology

I have found useful for this study scholarship on Buddhist attitudes to nature because these are closely related to the status of animals and plants in Buddhism and have allowed me to consider the extent to which Buddhist categorisations of the world into what lives and does not (reflecting an earlier cosmological divide into what eats and does not) differs from understandings found in other early Indian renouncer traditions. This has in turn allowed me to assess whether or not Buddhist food rules were instituted in response to such worldviews or the holding of them by rival renouncers. A number of scholars have explored such environmental issues. Among those scholars, Lambert Schmithausen presents the most comprehensive research on the topic. He relates Buddhist attitudes to both issues of practicality and the focus on intentionality in the Buddhist take on the doctrine of *karma*.²² He observes that “not killing living beings or abstention from injuring them is doubtless an important element of traditional Buddhist ethics, but it is, in Early Buddhism, conceived of in such a way that its demands remain within the limits of practicability.”²³ In terms of its cosmology, he assesses that “Buddhism has a practical point of view of sentient beings and narrows down the range of living and sentient beings,” and, “in the case of plants, Buddhism has weakened inhibition of plants considerably”²⁴ when compared

²² Schmithausen 1991a.

²³ *Ibid*: 29.

²⁴ *Ibid*: 5-6.

to other religions, especially Jainism. As he points out, this cuts out from Buddhism concerns with injuring seeds and plants found in Hinduism and Jainism from the later Vedic period. He discusses in detail plants such as fruits, raw grains, garlic and basic elements such as earth, water and fire. This means that when we find prohibitions in Buddhism that look similar to those found in Jainism, for example, we have to look to whether there are other specific motivations for their restriction or whether Buddhism is responding to expectations of lay people about renouncer behaviour more broadly, a motivation that we find particularly pertinent to the introduction of vegetarianism (Chapter Five). K. Okano also deals with the Buddhist understanding of nature drawing on two texts also used by Schmithausen, the *Aggañña Sutta* and the *Cakkavattisīhanāda Sutta*. His focus is on understanding the impact of human intention.²⁵ While Schmithausen's work has been important in helping me deepen my analysis in examining *vinaya* rules (Chapters Three to Five), I have found the *Aggañña Sutta* and the *Cakkavattisīhanāda Sutta*, as well as Okano's writing, particularly useful in Chapters One and Two. Useful also for my work on *vinaya* has been the writing of A. Hujimoto who discusses the status of plants as living beings based on evidence found in the Pali *Vinaya* and Abhidharma texts.²⁶

Vegetarianism

A common misconception in the West that all Buddhist monks and nuns, or even that all Buddhists in general, must be vegetarian informs a number of writings in the area of Buddhist ethics, some of which are primarily focused on modern practice. Often such writings start from first principles, such as the first of the five precepts not to kill, and impose their own model of ethics, rather than examining texts about actual monastic behaviour which is more informative of early Buddhism's ethical

²⁵ Okano 2002: 71-85.

²⁶ Hujimoto 2002.

models. One such example is J. Stewart who “looks favorably upon the possibility that Buddhism endorses vegetarianism as an implicit requirement following from its rejection of animal killing”.²⁷

Some scholars, including Schmithausen (above), have focused on the history of Buddhist attitudes to meat-eating in ways that have proved highly useful for this study. J. Kieschnick discusses significant extracts from the Theravāda *vinaya*, which are concerned with the acceptance and prohibition of meat-eating. Firstly, he deals with the regulation of three ways in which meat is pure, which I look at in some detail in Chapter Five. Kieschnick likewise deals with another monastic rule, which prohibits ten meats, and building on his work, I follow him to demonstrate in Chapter Five that these restrictions are not due to meat itself, but to social or physical reactions relating to kings, society in general, and those specific animals.²⁸ Much of my thesis supports Kieschnick’s summary that “Indian monks considered eating meat for medicinal purposes not only acceptable but necessary”²⁹ and that Pali texts do not provide any theoretical evidence to support vegetarianism. Schmithausen pays attention to the intention of a doer, exemplifying a case in which a person conducted killing but was exonerated because of it being an unintentional act.³⁰

My work in Chapter Five (and to a lesser extent Chapter Four) on the emerging vegetarianism advocated not in any of the *vinaya* but in Mahāyāna literature, as well as attitudes to pungent vegetables found in *vinaya* but developed further there, also owes much to work by Japanese scholars. T. Suzuki illustrates the lineage of Mahāyāna Buddhist texts such as the *Hastikakṣyā Sūtra*, *Mahāmegha Sūtra*, Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, *Āṅgulimāliya Sūtra* and *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which preach the

²⁷ Stewart 2010: 101.

²⁸ Kieschnick 2005: 188.

²⁹ *Ibid*: 189.

³⁰ Schmithausen 1991: 31.

prohibition of meat-eating.³¹ According to him, the attitude towards the prohibition of meat-eating in the relatively early *Mahāmegha Sūtra* is less strict than the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, which, compiled later, is severe in its insistence on the prohibition of meat-eating.³² K. Yasui deals with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* which also strictly prohibits meat-eating in any circumstances.³³

The Buddha's Last Meal

The Buddha's last meal is a topic that has been hotly debated amongst both Western and Eastern Buddhist scholars for more than a century. The main focus of the debate is the question of what the Buddha ate for the last meal that poisoned him and whether the substance eaten was pork or mushroom. The reason that this topic is the cause of such heated debate relates to the overall topic of our thesis, namely the regulations regarding what monks and nuns may eat. If we follow the East Asian traditions, which emphasise monastic vegetarianism, we must assume it cannot have been meat. The Theravāda, however, defends the meat-eating of their tradition. The debate is possible because of the ambiguity of the word compound used to refer to the substance the Buddha ate. Thus the debate has concentrated on the interpretation of the Pali word, *sūkara-maddava*, which can be understood to have two meanings: pork or mushroom. I initially included a summary of this debate and the chief findings of various scholars. However, since I do not address this debate in the thesis, and in order to save space, it is perhaps most important to report that scholars have the tendency to draw conclusions according to their personal Buddhist tradition. While I shall not be re-investigating this long-standing discussion, I may nonetheless hope that since it pays close attention to the early regulations and attitudes concerning

³¹ Suzuki 2003: 2.

³² *Ibid*: 4

³³ Yasui 1963.

food in the Pali literature, in comparison with the extant *vinaya* of non-Theravāda lineages, my thesis may contribute something to the subject. By providing scholars with a far more detailed analysis of the overall approach to food for the Buddha and his early followers, as far as textual analysis will allow, my thesis may allow scholars to move away from the single focus on the meal to the overall context in which it took place.

Another food-related topic that has been the subject of previous scholarship is Devadatta, the Buddha's cousin and rival, and the extra rules that he apparently sought to introduce, which included food restrictions, among them vegetarianism. In previous studies, this incident has been dealt with mainly by focusing on conflict or separation within the Buddhist Sangha.³⁴ I draw on the discussions of Devadatta briefly in Chapter Five, where I examine the rejection of vegetarianism in early Buddhism, the promulgation instead of the rules about meat being edible if pure in three ways, and the subsequent introduction of vegetarianism into Buddhism as attested in various Mahāyāna *sūtra*.

Kieschnick discusses Devadatta's five rules to highlight the Buddha's relatively moderate stance on asceticism in general, citing the Chinese version of the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* (Shisong lü: 十誦律).³⁵ H. Nakamura explores Devadatta's five extra rules to look at practical changes in the Sangha and in the social-historical background, pointing out that Devadatta's rule regarding taking alms-food indicate

³⁴ These are examples of this kind of study:

Matsunami 1979.

Walters. 1990.

For the purpose of this study, the two ancient records of travel in India written by two Chinese monks have been used: *Gaoseng fa xian chuan* (高僧法顯傳: T. LI. No. 2085. p. 861a) and *Datang xiyu ji* (大唐西域記: T. LI. No.2087. p.928a) mentions followers of Devadatta in 5th and 7th CE in India. This kind of study has been conducted by prominent Japanese scholars, e.g.: Nakamura 1974: 425–449; Hirakawa 1964: 476–477; Iwamoto 1978: 161–178; Sato 1972: 779–797.

³⁵ T. XXIII. No. 1435. p. 24b-c. Kieschnick 2005: 189.

the extent to which Buddhism (and Jainism) allowed invitations from the laity.³⁶ In relation to Devadatta's rule prohibiting fish and meat, Nakamura points out that Devadatta's rule is stricter than those of Buddhism and Jainism, which accepted fish and meat in alms-food even though they were later prohibited in Jainism.³⁷

A few scholars have paid attention to the alms round, the permitted ascetic practices and meditation in terms of religious cultivation.³⁸ J. Abe examines the meditative aspect of the alms-round, which emphasizes right contemplation of food and moderation in consuming food. He also considers the five methods of alms-round practice included in the thirteen Buddhist ascetic practices as a process of controlling the mind.³⁹ H. Nakamura (above) also discusses the social-cultural function of the alms-round as the lowest regarded method to live on, and how it is also generally held in contempt. Through the practice of the alms-round, many scholars have explored Buddhist ascetic practices, which are related to the three most important aspects of life: living place, food and clothes.⁴⁰ I have looked at the alms round primarily in the context of the relevant *vinaya* rules in Chapter Three, the ascetic practices in Chapter Two, and the meditation on the repulsiveness of food in Chapter Six. I have found particularly useful the work of K. Hayashima who unearthed the origin of the thirteen Buddhist ascetic practices, which derive from the theory of the *Parivāra*, through investigating the *Samyutta Nikāya*, *Udāna*, *Majjhima Nikāya*, *Mahāniddesa*, and *Theragāthā*.⁴¹ Interestingly, although the *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa uses the alms round as the basis of the meditation on the repulsiveness of food, scholars have not yet examined the relationship between the function of the alms-round and Buddhist

³⁶ Nakamura 1992: 432.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ On the alms round in later Buddhism see, e.g. Kondo 1960.

³⁹ Abe 2001: 34-35.

⁴⁰ See Bapat 1937; Mizuno 1954: 302ff.

⁴¹ Hayashima 1964: 68 ff.

meditation together. For example, Y. Takeuchi has studied ‘the Perception of Repulsiveness in Nutriment’, but he does not explicitly connect Buddhist meditation to the process of the alms-round, something which I do in Chapter Six.⁴²

Textual Sources

This is an entirely textual study. My main sources are the Theravāda *Vinaya Piṭaka* in Pali and the other extant *vinayas*, which survive in Chinese. Because of their importance, I have provided a ten-page summary of key information about these texts and the editions which I have used in the Appendix. The six extant *vinayas*, all used in this study, are the Theravāda, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Mahāsaṃghika, Sarvāstivāda, and Mūlasarvāstivāda.

In addition to the *vinaya* texts I shall refer to a number of other Pali and Chinese texts. To help me in my use of the Theravāda *vinaya* I will also refer to its commentary, the *Samantapāsādikā*.⁴³

In studying Chinese *vinaya*, there are three important *vinaya* commentaries, which were written in China by Dao Xuan (道宣).⁴⁴ Traditionally, these three *vinaya* commentaries have been considered as essential texts for the study of *vinaya* in Eastern Asia. They are:

- a. The *Sifenlu shanfanbuquexingshichao* (四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔)⁴⁵
- b. The *Tanwudebusifenlu shanbusuijijiemo* (曇無德部四分律刪補隨機羯磨)⁴⁶
- c. The *Sifenlu biquhanzhujieben* (四分律比丘含注戒本)⁴⁷

⁴² Takeuchi 1994.

⁴³ The Pali commentary for the *Vinaya*, the *Samantapāsādikā*, was translated in 489AD by Saṅghabhadra (僧伽跋陀羅) with the title *shanjianlu piposha* (善見律毘婆沙). This is one of two works translated from Pali to Chinese. The other possible Pali text is the *Vimuttimaggā* (Jietuodaolun, 解脫道論).

⁴⁴ Dao Xuan (道宣, 596-667 A.D.) was a Buddhist monk during the Tang dynasty in China.

⁴⁵ T. XL, No. 1804.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* No. 1808.

In order to further investigate the theme of food and compare and contrast the Buddhist stance with that of other Indian religions, texts from Hinduism and Jainism shall be touched upon. Hinduism has a wide range of food regulations based on various attitudes with regard to issues such as the nature of food, religious impurity and social class. Attitudes to food in Brahmanism are significant factors which might have had some influence from the time of the Buddha to the Mahāyāna period. As for Jainism, it has an elaborate theory of food and applies the theory to practice in daily life. In particular, it has the strictest regulations on killing or harming sentient beings, which includes even plants. In comparing and contrasting attitudes to food in Buddhism with that of Jainism, one can furnish a vivid picture of the attitude to animals and plants in Buddhism. The texts from the two religions have been established over long historical periods and in order to understand the original attitudes to food in Hinduism and Jainism, earlier *sūtra* from the two religions will be examined. I introduce Jain texts as I use them. There are four Hindu law texts that I have referred to, which have been established from the second half of the fourth century B.C.E. onwards:⁴⁸

A. *Dharma Sūtra*:

- a. *Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra* (third century BCE)
- b. *Gautama Dharma Sūtra* (early second century BCE)
- c. *Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra* (mid to late second century BCE)
- d. *Vasiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra* (first century BCE)⁴⁹

The most important Hindu Law text is *the Manusmṛti*. As Olivelle points out, this text opened a new chapter in the history of *Dharmaśāstra* literature.⁵⁰ I have drawn on it,

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* No. 1806.

⁴⁸ Olivelle 2010: 37.

⁴⁹ For the order of dating to these four texts, I have followed the opinion of Patrick Olivelle (Olivelle 2010: 38, footnote 23).

using Olivelle's translation, because it could throw light on the changes of attitude to food in Mahāyāna Buddhism since, being dated to the second century C.E.⁵¹ it may precede the establishment of middle-era Mahāyāna sūtra by one or two hundred years.

B. *Manusmṛti* (MS) (second century CE):

In order to determine the context and meaning of MS, I shall refer to some post-Manu *dharmaśāstra* that were established before the sixth century C.E.. when Indian Mahāyāna sūtra prohibited meat-eating and the consumption of pungent vegetables.

C. Post-Manu *Dharmaśāstra*:

- a. *Yājñavalkya Dharmaśāstra* (fourth to fifth century)
- b. *Nārada Dharmaśāstra* (fifth to sixth century)
- c. *Bṛhaspati Dharmaśāstra* (fifth to sixth century)

In order to look at the transition from the inclusion of meat in the monastic diet in the *vinaya* to its exclusion in some Mahāyāna sūtra, I examine some of the latter which are well known for their strict attitude regarding meat-eating and consuming pungent vegetables. The relevant Mahāyāna sūtra are as follows:

D. Mahāyāna sūtra examined in relation to meat-eating and consuming pungent vegetables⁵²

- a) The Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāna Sūtra* (*Dabanniepan jing*, 大般涅槃經)⁵³
- b) *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*⁵⁴ (*Lenggabatuoluobao jing*, 楞伽阿跋陀羅寶經 *Rulengga jing*, 入楞伽經; *Dachengrulengga jing*, 大乘入楞伽經)⁵⁵

⁵⁰ Olivelle 2010: 40; Olivelle (trans.) *The Law Code of Manu*. 2004 : xx.

⁵¹ Again, I have followed Olivelle's dating of the *Manusmṛti*. 2010: 42.

⁵² Additional sūtra are introduced as I address them.

⁵³ T. XII. No. 0375.

- c) The Mahāyāna *Brahmajāla Sūtra* (*Fanwangjinglushenafoshu opusaxindijiepindishi*
梵網經盧舍那佛說菩薩心地戒品第十)

I have looked at a number of texts in relation to meditation. The Pali texts used are as follows:

E. Some early Pali texts

- a. *Dhammapada*
- b. *Suttanipāta*
- c. *Theragāthā*

F. The four *Nikāyas* and their commentaries

- a. *Dīgha Nikāya*, the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*
- b. *Majjhima Nikāya*, the *Papañcasūdanī*
- c. *Samyutta Nikāya*, the *Sāratthappakāsinī*
- d. *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the *Manorathapūranī*

The four Pali *nikāya* and their commentaries, which were composed by Buddhaghosa, are indispensable materials for the study of the *nikāya*.⁵⁶ The commentaries provide doctrinal annotation, etymologies and social-cultural background, etc. While passages in the earlier Pali texts that make reference to the relationship between food and meditation do not fully develop this relationship, such ideas have come to be systematic in the later Pali commentarial texts, in particular, the *Visuddhimagga*.

The *Visuddhimagga*, which is viewed as the fully fledged Pali commentarial work for Buddhist doctrine and meditative theories, can give us comprehensive explanations that can help us to understand Theravāda concepts of food and

⁵⁴ There are three Chinese translations of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

⁵⁵ This was translated by Śikṣānanda in 700-704. T. XVI. No. 672

⁵⁶ Hirakawa 1993: 73.

meditation, and the close connection between the two. Another relevant text, which may have been composed in Pali, is the *Vimuttimaggā*, now extant only in Chinese. Some consider it as a model for the composition of the *Visuddhimaggā*.⁵⁷ The Chinese version of the Pali work can be used for the same purpose as the *Visuddhimaggā*.

In order to grasp the theoretical changes in the meditation on repulsiveness in nutriments, some Chinese versions of Abhidharma texts will be used in this study.

Those Abhidharma texts are as follows:

- a. *Abhidharma Saṅgitiparyāya* (*Apidamojiyimenzu lun*, 阿毘達磨集異門足論)⁵⁸
- b. *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra* (*Abidamodapiposha lun*, 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論)⁵⁹
- c. *Satyasiddhi Śāstra* (*Chengshilun*, 成實論)⁶⁰

The different concepts of food and the human body start to be revealed in the *Abhidharma Saṅgitiparyāya* which holds a different viewpoint on the meditation related to food to that of the Pali Buddhist tradition. The analysis and comparison between the Pali texts, the texts from the Sarvāstivāda school and Mahāyāna texts

⁵⁷ The Japanese scholar, Misuno, reviews different opinions about the chronological order of the two works, *Vimuttimaggā* and *Visuddhimaggā*. According to his account, there are four hypotheses in relation to the two:

- a. Buddhaghosa used Upatissa's work, the *Vimuttimaggā*, following its structure, adding to and expanding it when he composed his *Visuddhimaggā*.
- b. Upatissa referred to the *Visuddhimaggā*, shortened and modified it, and authored the *Vimuttimaggā*.
- c. There were commentaries on the *Tipiṭaka* before Upatissa and Buddhaghosa. Based on those works, the two commentators separately wrote the two commentaries.
- d. The main content of the *Vimuttimaggā* existed before Buddhaghosa, and Mahāyāna ideas were added when *Saṅghabhadra* translated the *Vimuttimaggā* into Chinese.

Of these four theories, c is supported by Malalasekera (1928), Japanese scholars are in favor of d, and Bapat approved of a. In this thesis I follow position a. (Misuno 1997: 145-146; 158.)

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* No. 1536.

⁵⁹ The *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra* is a major work by the Sarvāstivāda school which includes and expands the Abhidharma contents of the school. T. XXVII. No. 1545

⁶⁰ Harivarman authored the *Satyasiddhi Śāstra*. This treatise has tendency to interpret issues from the point of view of the Sautrāntika school and to exclude the viewpoint of the Sarvāstivāda school. T. XXXII. No. 1646.

will throw light on the understanding of the concept of food, body, and the meditation, the perception of repulsiveness in nutriment.

The additional Mahāyāna sūtra that will be used to explore this theme are:

- a. *Parinirvana Sūtra* (*Dabanniepanjing*, 大般涅槃經)
- b. *Xiūxíngdàodì jīng* (修行道地經)
- c. *Dàfāngdǎngdàjí jīng* (大方廣大集經)

Research methodology

In this study, the main research sources are the canonical and commentarial Pāli texts, which were established in different time periods. The range of the research sources covers the Pali canon (*sutta*), discipline (*vinaya*), analysis of causality (*abhidhamma*), commentaries and Chinese versions of Sanskrit texts. Therefore, the primary research method I will use in this study is dictated by its close dealings with primary texts, mainly Pāli and Chinese sources. My approach to textual studies, while primarily based on the types of study conducted in my own previous academic milieu at Dongguk University in S. Korea, share some features described in biblical studies, the application of which to Buddhist studies was taught by Andrew Skilton at SOAS, during the earlier stage of my Ph.D. writing there, before my move to King's College.⁶¹ Based on my understanding of the categorisation of approaches to textual exegesis in Biblical Studies, the following methods shall be used in order to achieve the purpose of this study:

- A. Synchronic approach (textual analysis)
- B. Diachronic approach (textual criticism)
 - a. textual criticism

⁶¹ Gorman 2010.

- b. historical criticism
- C. Doctrinal approach
- D. Psychological or Meditative approach

The main content of this study will be derived from primary sources and the first task will be to understand the context and significance of a particular topic by means of text analysis. Inter-textual analysis among Pali texts or Chinese sources or between Pali and Chinese texts is also undertaken in order to grasp these varying contexts and significances. This inter-textual analysis will be done in both synchronic and diachronic methods through which context and significance can be understood more clearly and accurately. As for textual criticism, Buddhist texts have various layers of establishment, corresponding to different periods of time. In the case of Pali texts, it is said that early Pali canonical texts would have been established around the 2nd – 3rd century BCE, but their commentaries were compiled in their current form in the early 5th century C.E. However, more significant textual criticism is necessary in order to analyse the parts of particular texts, such as the parts of Pali *vinaya* which are established in different time periods. Buddhist texts were produced in concrete socio-political and cultural situations and they refer explicitly or implicitly to political realities and to social customs, classes, conditions, relationships, etc. In order to determine and describe the socio-political context and cultural conditions of Buddhist texts, a historical approach shall be undertaken with regard to certain areas of investigation. An historical approach will be most appropriate if we are to understand the historical conditions in which the Mahāyāna *sūtra* that strictly prohibit meat-eating and pungent vegetables were composed. While this study does not focus on doctrinal subjects, there are some doctrinal issues, particularly those related to karma and rebirth that will be relevant in examining the *Aggañña Sutta*.

Regarding transliteration of foreign terms, I use standard methods for Sanskrit and Pali and Pinyin for Chinese. I treat Buddha, dharma, sangha, bodhisattva and karma as Anglicized terms. Unless otherwise stated, translations from the Chinese are my own.

Chapter 1

Early Buddhist Cosmology and the Nature of Food

In this chapter, I shall explore the topic of food, using the Pāli cosmological text the *Aggañña sutta* from the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the first division of the *Sutta Piṭaka* of the Pali canon (DN 27). This text is sometimes referred to as offering an origination myth, since it gives an account of the origins of the world and society – it was entitled ‘A Book of Genesis’ in its initial translation into English by C. A. F. and T. W. Rhys Davids.⁶² Steven Collins describes this story about origins as a ‘parable’ rather than a myth because of its didactic purpose in teaching morality. He translates the title as ‘The Discourse on What is Primary’, in order to convey the different possible connotations of *Aggañña*, which are not mutually exclusive, as to what is first, i.e. what was in the beginning or what is best.⁶³ The text is interesting for its thesis on food, for the *sutta* teaches the appropriate monastic attitude to food. It is also interesting because the worldview underpinning the parable reveals understandings about the relationship between food and a number of other systems: the cosmos, society, psychology and physiology. Some aspects of this relationship between the *Aggañña Sutta* and the worldview of its context have been explored before by other scholars, as shall be discussed here, but some have not.

1-1. A critique of brahmanical claims to purity

The *Aggañña Sutta* is an explicit critique of the brahmanical understanding that one’s position within the Hindu caste system is an indicator of purity. According to the

⁶² C. A. F. and T. W. Rhys Davids 1921: 77-94. For a discussion of Rhys Davids’ choice of this title for his Western audience, see Gombrich 1992a: 159ff.

⁶³ Collins 1993: 331.

Vedic hymn the *Puruṣasūkta*,⁶⁴ the hymn in which the primordial being is sacrificed to create the universe, the four broad castes of the Hindu caste system issue forth from four parts of his body: the Brahmins or priestly class from the mouth, the *kṣatriya* or warrior class from the arms, the *vaiśya*, the class responsible for agriculture, from the thighs, and the *śūdra*, or servant class, from his feet. The hierarchy of these physical origins, with the mouth as the highest and the feet as the lowest, is then interpreted as authorising the relative status and purity of the groups, with the Brahmins at the top. At the opening of the *Aggañña sutta*, two Brahmins – who later go on to become monks – report to the Buddha on how their families have criticised them for deserting their own kind, who are pure and of the highest class, and for mixing with those from lower castes, i.e. the Buddha’s followers who are drawn from a variety of caste backgrounds.

The Buddha responds to the attitudes that the two Brahmins report with alternative interpretations of purity, one based on the notion, generally accepted in South Asian religion, of the physical impurity of the female reproductive system, and the other based on moral purity:⁶⁵ firstly, since Brahmins, like other castes, are born from the vaginas of women⁶⁶, smeared in their blood, they are vagina-born, not mouth-born and from that perspective just as physically impure as all other humans; secondly, since, just as there are those in each of the castes who behave well, there are similarly members of all four castes who do wrong, by killing, stealing, lying, etc., it follows that good and bad qualities are found amongst all classes and Brahmins

⁶⁴ *Rg Veda* X. 90.

⁶⁵ Collins discusses this in terms of hierarchy, expanding on Burghart’s ‘Hierarchical Models of the Hindu Social System’ (Burghart 1978): “The Brahmanical hierarchy is expressed in terms of ritual purity and ‘the sacrificial body of Brahma’ Ascetic hierarchy is expressed in terms of ... rebirth. (I would add in the Buddhist case a universal morality which overrides social hierarchy of all kinds...). Kingly hierarchy...is expressed in terms of a ‘tenorial hierarchy’ ... construed as a divine marriage between god-king and the earth.” (Collins 1993: 310).

⁶⁶ Early translators use ‘womb’ for *yoni*. I am here following Collins’ more explicit translation 1993: 339.

cannot claim the high ground on the basis of moral purity. A third notion of purity, the one on which the Brahmins based their claim, is ritual purity going back to the origination myth of the *Puruṣasūkta* hymn. In the rest of the *sutta*, the Buddha offers an alternative origination story, one in which greed is the basis of physical differentiation and therefore of the caste system and is also the basis of the current system of farming and storing food. The *sutta* provides a myth for the origin of the first king – elected to mete out punishment as people’s conduct disintegrates – and provides multiple reinterpretations and etymologies (Sk. *nirukti*) mostly based on language but also based on folk or religious practice.

One thread of these *nirukti* is used to explain the origin of renouncers – i.e. the group to which Buddhists monks belong – and so to provide the model for monasticism. The first renouncers were a group of people who decided to discard the greedy and unwholesome ways of the village life and are termed both *brahmin*, which is used in early Buddhist literature in the broader sense of a holy person, and *jhāyaka*, ‘those who meditate.’⁶⁷ When some of the renouncers were unable to keep to this regime, they returned to settle nearby the villages and compile books, so they were called *ajjhāyaka* ‘non-meditators’. The term *ajjhāyaka* literally means ‘those who study’, and as such is a word for a scholarly brahmin, derived from the prefix and verb *adhi + i* ‘to approach/study.’ However, the Buddha provides an alternative etymology or *nirukti* of *ajjhāyaka*, deriving it instead from the negative prefix *a-* and the root *dhyai* (meditate, Pali *jhāyati*). So rather than being ‘scholars’, the brahmins are now ‘non-meditators.’ As Richard Gombrich points out, this pun works in multiple languages, from Sanskrit, through northern *Prakrits* to Pali.⁶⁸ Here the Buddhist text is satirising the cleric priests as failed meditators: the reference to keeping books is

⁶⁷ See also the possible reference to tending a sacrificial fire proposed by Collins 1993: 346, which fits with other references to fire in the *sutta*.

⁶⁸ Gombrich 1992a: 163.

clearly a reference to the primary activities of brahmins as priests, scholars and clerics, and so the Buddha provides an origination myth in which the brahmin class has descended from a group of failed renouncers, and is inferior to the wandering meditators, the Buddhist monks.

The *Aggañña Sutta* is a rich and interesting text and since relatively early in the Western study of Pali literature it has been explored by a number of scholars wanting to reveal its rich satirical content or to understand social theories such as ownership, kingship, and social class.⁶⁹ More recently, in the past two decades, environmental and ecological issues have also been explored through the *sutta*.⁷⁰ It is the work of two particular scholars that is most relevant to my interest in this text for understanding the early Buddhist attitudes to food. Patrick Olivelle has looked at the text in terms of how it offers an ascetic view of the world and Steven Collins has shown how it provides a prototype for correct monastic behaviour. While I accept the satirical intent explored by Gombrich – and we shall in Chapter 3 see other uses of humour to teach – I find the detailed nature of the text too rich to be satire alone: the form that

⁶⁹ See Gombrich 1992a: 159ff. for the earliest European studies. Examples of scholarship examining social theory include S. J. Tambiah (1976), who looks at the *sutta* from the perspective of kingship as the corrective for disorder in human affairs; and F. Reynolds (1972: 18-21) who explores the *sutta* with the viewpoints of 1) the function of royal authority, 2) social contract theory of the state and kingship, and 3) the figure and function of the *Cakkavatti*. The satirical intent was noted by T. W. Rhys Davids (1899: 107) and by Wendy O’Flaherty (1976), as pointed out in Collins 1993: 313. This understanding of the satirical stance of the *Aggañña sutta* was taken further by Gombrich, who details its relationship to some brahminical literature (Gombrich 1992a). In a very short article following the previous article, he argues that “the *Aggañña sutta* has parodistically turned *kṣatra*, powers, into *kṣetra*, field” and the meaning of the warrior class (*khattiya*) which means “lord/owner of the fields (*khettānaṃ pati*)” in Pāli is derived from that “the Buddhist text is based on knowledge of brahminical texts, and satirises them.”(1992b: 213).

⁷⁰P.D. Ryan (1998) explores the deterioration of Nature in the *Aggañña sutta* from the viewpoint of morality. Pragati Sahni (2008) looks at the environmental viewpoint of the *Aggañña sutta* through four factors: the role of human beings, four fundamental elements (earth, water, fire and wind), vegetables and beings (*satta*). Okano Kiyoshi (2008) investigates the parallel in the *saṃmitiya* school of the *Aggañña sutta* in which animals and plants take revenge on humans who treated the animals and plants abusively. He (2004) also examines linguistically the variations of the names of the first foods in the *Aggañña sutta* before wild rice appears.

the satire takes also tells us much about the Buddhist worldview. So while Gombrich is of the opinion that “the Buddha never intended to give [a literal account of the origin of this world]; the original intention of the text is satirical.”⁷¹ I am inclined to concur with Patrick Olivelle’s response: “If it were pure satire, it would be difficult to explain why the author of the myth should have gone into such minute detail regarding food, food production, sexuality, houses, and social structure.” Olivelle adds, “The use of this myth in the Buddhist explanation of the origin of kingship, and the parallel account in the *Liṅgapurāṇa*, also argue against pure satire.”⁷² I shall return to Olivelle’s discussion of the *Aggañña Sutta* and *Liṅgapurāṇa* in the next chapter, when looking at how the Buddha’s position on consuming food differs from that of other renouncer groups. In this chapter, I want to take further his examination of the cosmology of the *Aggañña Sutta* to locate the place of food in the Buddhist understanding of the world at that time. The *Aggañña Sutta* is particularly useful in the study of early Buddhist attitudes to food because it records early Buddhist understandings of cosmological, psychological, physiological and social developments both in nature and in human beings, all in relation to the response of humans to food. The human response to food is, then, primary to the deterioration of multiple aspects of the world and society. The cosmology offers a narrative that informs monks about appropriate and inappropriate conduct, in particular in relation to food. This aspect of the text, its importance in teaching monks what to do, has been recognised by Collins’ who provided very specific evidence in his detailed article, ‘The Discourse on What is Primary.’⁷³ Collins recognised that some of the points about food in the *Aggañña Sutta* were quite precise

⁷¹ Gombrich 1992a: 161.

⁷² Olivelle 1991: 36.

⁷³ Collins 1993.

references to specific Buddhist *vinaya* rules about food ⁷⁴ (rules that we shall examine in detail in chapter 3), and therefore Collins' work is also important to my study.

While interpreting the text in terms of its own content, scholars have sometimes used non-Buddhist texts such as Brahmanical or Western philosophical texts to interpret the *Aggañña Sutta*. Like Collins, who looked at other texts and their commentaries in the Pali canon, I shall use mainly Buddhist texts. I shall use a wider spectrum of Buddhist sources than Collins in that I shall be looking beyond the Pali canon. In addition to parallel versions of the text in Pāli and in Chinese, there are a number of later texts, including *Abhidharma* texts, that use the *Aggañña Sutta* to discuss the relationship between the nature of food and human morality. I shall therefore draw on Pāli canonical and commentarial texts, parallel versions of the *Aggañña Sutta* found in the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*, and *Abhidharma* texts, mainly those from the Sarvāstivāda school but also those from other schools such as the *Saṃmitiya*.

1-2. The *Aggañña Sutta* as a Parable for Monks

Olivelle proposes in his article that the perspective of food present in the *Aggañña Sutta* originated from Indian renouncer attitudes to food and their rejection of the food practices that make up normal societal living. He investigates this in relation to four aspects of food practice that Indian renunciators – in his term, 'ascetics'⁷⁵ – sought to avoid: production, storage, preparation, and consumption. While different renouncer groups varied in the extent to which they rejected these

⁷⁴ For example, 1. feeding on rapture in the 10th paragraph of the translation by Collins (Collins 1993: 341); 2. How the etymology *aho rasam*, (look, the earth essence (has disappeared)) works in the 13th paragraph (*ibid*: 342); 3. Generation of sexual organs in female and male and building houses in the 16th paragraph (*ibid*: 343).

⁷⁵ I use the term 'renouncer' by preference because of the rejection of much of ascetic culture by Buddhists, even while they share with other renouncer groups the aim of rejecting crucial aspects of *saṃsāra* or *pravṛtti* (see below).

activities, we can say that in general they all attempted to avoid engaging in the first three and all reduced, moderated or even gave up, as far as is possible, the final one. Olivelle points out that in the *Aggañña Sutta* the crucial act which leads to the loss of the paradisiacal state in the beginning of the universe was eating, and that the eating causes “a progressive addiction to and dependence on food.”⁷⁶ He suggests that the *Aggañña Sutta* indicates that the early Buddhist monks who composed or compiled it detected a relationship between food and attachment not only at the personal level but at the societal and cosmological levels as well.

Steven Collins also makes the connection between the *Aggañña Sutta* and renouncer attitudes to food, but to a much more specific degree. He relates the *Aggañña Sutta* to the rules of Pali *vinaya* which specify those activities in relation to food that monks should avoid.⁷⁷ Collins opens his article by referring to the work of social anthropologist Ernest Gellner, in particular his statement that, as they develop, agrarian societies tend to ‘develop complex social differentiation, an elaborate division of labour...the emergence of a specialized ruling class, and of a specialized clerisy.’⁷⁸ Gellner also points out that, since agrarian society depends on the storage of food, this necessitates some kind of enforcement of its division and protection, and so sanctions violence.⁷⁹ Collins points out the usefulness of these perspectives for understanding the relationship between South Asian values of non-violence and the necessity of violence or at least the threat of it to maintain the stability of the position of those propounding such values. He also points out the striking parallels between Gellner’s theory and the series of events outlined in the *Aggañña Sutta* that give an account of the establishment of kingship.⁸⁰ Collins then proceeds to explore a series of

⁷⁶ Olivelle 1987: 31-32.

⁷⁷ Collins 1993: 326.

⁷⁸ Gellner 1983: 17, cited Collins 1993: 304.

⁷⁹ Gellner 1983: 275, cited Collins 1993: 305.

⁸⁰ Collins 1993: 305.

references to the Buddhist monastic code in the *sutta* in order to show that, “Monks, ideally, like the beings in the parable when in the ‘paradisial’ state before their ‘Fall’ into agriculture and ordered society, neither produce nor store their food.”⁸¹ To confirm this, Collins draws on other Pali texts, such as the *Brāhmaṇadhammika Sutta*.⁸² In that text, the Buddha portrays brahmins of old as initially living disinterested in wealth, food and sex: “They had no wealth, but begged their food from door to door; they lived as celibate students for 48 years, and then married within their own group without bride-price; those who were married had sex only at the right time”, while “the supreme brahman [i.e. God]...did not indulge in sexual intercourse even in a dream.”⁸³ Their downfall came when they began coveting the wealth and women of kings, composing hymns to acquire wealth, and hoarding it. Collins demonstrates how such narratives seek to reinforce the notion that the values and way of life of Buddhist monks (living from alms food, remaining celibate, not seeking wealth) are the ideal that pre-existed the corruption that caused divisions within the society whose values Buddhist monks seek to renounce.

Collins also demonstrates that the explanation of the creation of the different castes within society in these texts cannot be taken as a social charter for those divisions since another Pali *sutta*, the *Assalāyana Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* shows awareness that other societies had different numbers of classes, and that the classes are “local and contingent arrangements...which means that ‘we must take the story of origins in the *Aggañña Sutta* to be a parable exemplifying a moral truth rather than an account intended to convey a simple (and single) historical truth.”⁸⁴

The narrative places Buddhist monks both outside of and above the hierarchy. I accept Collins’ position, which I shall pursue further. I am also interested by the

⁸¹ Collins 1993: 305-306.

⁸² Sn. 284-315.

⁸³ Collins 1993: 320.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*: 323.

presence in both texts of an association between food and sex. Is this association made simply because both are items on the list of temptations of society, which, like wealth, monks give up, or is there a closer link?

After exploring the connection between the *sutta* and the affirmation of monastic practice, as presented by Olivelle and – in more detail – Collins, I will investigate the significance of food, and greedy responses to it, including its relationship with to the broader ‘greed (*lobha*)’ which includes sexual lust. In turn, I shall show a connection between how the Buddhist understanding of the relationship between the two on the cosmological level and in terms of the ideal monastic is informed by a physiological or medical understanding of the relationship between food and sexuality.

In examining the detailed correlation between the *Aggañña Sutta* and *vinaya* rules, Collins includes the following parallels between attitudes to food and *vinaya* rules concerning food:

“The first food-stuffs likened to ghee (*sappi*), cream (*navanīta*) and honey (*madhu*): three of the five ‘medicines’ allowed to monks and nuns (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya* 23).”⁸⁵

This rule permits monks five sumptuous food items when they are ill, the other two items in the list being oil (*tela*) and molasses (*phāṇita*).⁸⁶

“Tasting the ‘earth-essence [savoury earth]’ with the finger: contravenes *Sekhiya* rules 52 and 53.” (*ibid.*).

These rules prohibit licking the hands and the bowl.

“Taking (big) mouthfuls with the hands: contravenes *Sekhiya* rules 39, 40 and (possibly) 42 and 46.” (*ibid.*).

These rules prohibit taking big mouthfuls, taking excessively sized mouthfuls, inserting the whole hand into the mouth and stuffing out the cheeks respectively.

“Storing food for 8 days: contravenes *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* 23 and *Pācittiya* 38.” (*ibid.*)

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 326.

⁸⁶ *Vin.* III, p.199.

These rules prohibit storing the five medicines for more than seven days and chewing or consuming stored-up food respectively. As Collins shows in his more detailed discussion, storing rice is allowed for monks for up to seven days, and in the *Sutta* it has no consequences “until one being goes over the seven day *Vinaya* limit.”⁸⁷

It is details such as these that establish the accuracy of Collins’ interpretation of the *Aggañña Sutta* as a parable for monks to help them understand appropriate monastic behaviour. Collins also notes other parallels: how having sex contravenes celibacy, how making houses contravenes the ideal of homelessness, and how the term *mahāsammata* ‘great elected’ is modeled on monastic appointments.⁸⁸ He also notes broader parallels, such as that between, in the *Aggañña Sutta*, the bad actions of people as conditions deteriorate, and their polar opposites as embedded in the five precepts ideally undertaken by all Buddhists.

In showing the connection between the *Aggañña sutta* and Indian renouncer practices and Pali *vinaya* relating to food, Olivelle and Collins provide a framework for interpreting the *sutta*. I completely accept the parallels Collins draws, and shall return to both Olivelle’s discussion of the relationship between the cosmology and renouncer food practices (in Chapter 2) and the pertinent *vinaya* rules in (Chapter 3). Here I wish to focus on the text’s understanding of food in relation to celibacy in the overall cosmology. The purpose of this chapter is to augment and build on Olivelle’s and Collins’ points by examining the *sutta* in relation to two concepts: 1) the shift from gluttony to lust, and 2) the deterioration of nature and human beings through the latters’ craving for food. In doing so, we will touch on the debate about whether the text was intended to be regarded as historically true, and whether it has been regarded as such.

⁸⁷ Collins 1993: 330.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

1-3. The Deterioration of the Universe

As mentioned above, Western scholars, largely responding to Gombrich, have debated whether the origination ‘myth’ contained in the *Aggañña Sutta* was intended to be understood as literally true at the time of its composition, regardless of its being taken as providing a historically authoritative model for kingship in later Sri Lanka. Collins suggests that Buddhism in Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia, in view of its close relationship with royal authority, “became more concerned with cosmology and cosmogony...than it ever was in India.”⁸⁹ He suggests that, at that point, the text was more likely to be taken as an account of cosmology than as the parable that it had been in its original context, while its anti-brahmanical satire would have remained evident because of the ongoing competition with brahmins. His point is partly a reflection of the absence in the Pali commentary to the text of an interpretation along the lines of the understanding of the *vinaya* parallels which Collins discovered. I might add that a further reason for this, other than textual specialisation, might be the evolution by this time in how Buddhist temples functioned. As key institutions within society, and often wealthy, practices such as their storage of food may have altered considerably. Like Olivelle, I shall here take the *sutta*’s cosmology and cosmogony at face value, whether or not they were seen as historically accurate at the time of its composition, since it contains assumptions that may accurately reveal early Buddhist understandings of the relationship between the desire for food and other vices, as experienced by the individual, and between food and the way the cosmos and society function.

⁸⁹ Collins 1993: 325.

Traditionally, Buddhism has classified the deterioration of the state of the universe found in the *Aggañña sutta* into three to five stages, each pertaining to a different item or aspect of life. The state of food is one of these aspects. For example, volume 113 of the Sarvāstivāda *abhidharma* text, the *Apidamodapiposhalun* (*Mahāvibhāṣa śāstra*, 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論) categorizes the deterioration of the state of the universe into four stages: 1) shortening of life span, 2) decrease in the number of human beings, 3) deterioration of food quality, 4) deterioration of morality.⁹⁰ On the other hand, the Mahāyāna treatise, the *Yuqie shidi lun* (*Yogācāra bhūmi śāstra*, 瑜伽師地論) divides the deterioration of the universe into three: 1) shortening of life span, 2) decrease in the size of human bodies, 3) deterioration of the state of necessities including food.⁹¹

Even though the Theravāda texts do not provide the classification of the state of the universe as found in the Sarvāstivāda *abhidharma* texts and Mahāyāna treatises, we can similarly classify the deterioration of the state of the universe into five stages when we look at Pāli texts such as the *Cakkavattisīhanāda Sutta* (DN: 26) and the *Aggañña Sutta* (DN:27). They are: 1) deterioration of food quality, 2) deterioration of human bodies, 3) decrease of life span, 4) deterioration of the natural world, 5) deterioration of morality. The inclusion of the decrease of life span amongst these five derives from the *Cakkavattisīhanāda sutta*; the rest comes from the *Aggañña Sutta*.

1-4. Objective and Subjective Aspects of Food

In its description of the deterioration of the quality of food, the *Aggañña Sutta* identifies two significant aspects of food, the objective and the subjective. The objective aspect is the essential physical make-up of food, its colour, fragrance and

⁹⁰ T. XXVII. p.588a-b.

⁹¹ T. XXX. p.286a.

taste; the way it grows. The subjective aspect is the human response to food: the manner of eating and harvesting it, the cravings for the taste of food, and gluttony.⁹² As we shall see in subsequent chapters, it is the subjective aspects that are treated in most detail in the *vinaya* and in meditation texts, which seek to contain such negative subjective responses through disciplinary rules and through attitude-altering meditation practice respectively. We shall also see that while it is helpful to categorise the two aspects as subjective and objective, these terms cannot be applied literally in this context, since the two aspects interrelate and modify each other. In other words, it is not only that the subjective aspect derives in part from the objective aspect, but that the objective aspect is affected by – and thus partially derived from – the subjective aspect.

Before discussing the subjective aspects of food in the *Aggañña Sutta*, we shall examine the objective aspects of food as further defined in the commentarial period by different schools of Buddhism. Buddhist schools have different definitions of the characteristics of food as an object of those sense organs which have primary significance for comprehending the objective aspect of food.

The Pali *Visuddhimagga* mentions, explaining the cosmogonic process in chapter XIII, that the “first food (essential humus) possesses colour, smell and taste, like the surface film on milk rice when it dries up.”⁹³ These three factors in food are elsewhere mentioned in the *Aggañña sutta* and the *Visuddhimagga*.⁹⁴ However, the Pāli canonical and commentarial texts otherwise do not explicitly define the characteristics of food. They are mentioned in the Sarvāstivāda treatise, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* (*Abhidharmanyāyānusāra śāstra*, 阿毘達磨順正理論) where the text

⁹² DN. III. p.85.

⁹³ Ñāṇamoli 1991: 413.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*: 252, 109; DN. III. p. 85.

states that the Sthaviravāda considers the colours and visual forms, fragrance, and taste as the characteristics of food.⁹⁵

The *Apidamo shunzhengli lun*, as a treatise of the Sarvāstivāda school, classifies three characteristics of food – 1. fragrance (*gandha*), 2. taste (*rasa*) and 3. touch (*phoṭṭhabba*). These three characteristics correspond to the sense organs registering smell, taste and touch. The Sarvāstivāda further adds that there is just one kind of smell (*gandha*) and one kind of taste (*rasa*) but 11 kinds of touch (*phoṭṭhabba*), based on the six āyatana.⁹⁶ This categorisation of the objective aspect of food into the three āyatana of smell, taste and touch as characteristics in the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* emphasises the aspects of food as a substance for eating. The *phoṭṭhabba* aspects include the four elements (earth, water, fire and wind) that make up their materiality, and then aspects of the feel of them during and after consumption.⁹⁷

Two of the characteristics of food accepted by the two Buddhist schools whose texts are examined here are fragrance (*gandha*) and taste (*rasa*). According to the remarks of the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun*, which refer to the characteristics of food not only of the Sarvāstivāda but also of Sthaviravāda traditions, a third characteristic of food is its visible form (*rūpa*) or touch (*phoṭṭhabba*) in the Sthaviravāda and in the Sarvāstivāda traditions respectively. We do not have the Pali texts which expound in detail the characteristics of food, but we can see an explanation of the visible form (*rūpa*) in Sthaviravāda tradition only in the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun*. Therefore, we have reached a limitation in that we can only get information on the visible form

⁹⁵ T. XXIX. p. 510c. It is not clear whether the referent is to the Theravada branch of Sthaviravāda here since there is no clear distinction in the terminology. Therefore I do not know if this is referring to Pali texts or other Buddhist texts.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 510a. There are three kinds of smells: 1) pleasant, 2) offensive, 3) not-pleasant nor-offensive (T. XXIX. p. 334b). There are six kinds of tastes: 1) sweet, 2) sour, 3) salty, 4) spicy, 5) bitter, 6) umami (T. XXIX. p. 334b). In the classification of touch, there are eleven kinds: 1) earth, 2) water, 3) fire, 4) wind, with the increase or decrease of the four elements, there are seven more touches: 5) slipperiness, 6) prickliness, 7) heaviness, 8) lightness, 9) coldness, 10) hunger, 11) thirstiness (T. XXIX. p. 334c).

⁹⁷ See previous.

(*rūpa*) in the Sthaviravāda of which Pali tradition is a branch through the viewpoint of the Sarvāstivāda school.

The *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* says that in Sthaviravāda tradition, the *rūpa* of food, which could have the sense of either ‘visible form’ or ‘materiality’, refers to colours and shapes and is asserted as one of the three characteristics (*rūpa*, *gandha* and *rasa*) of food.⁹⁸ The criticism that the Sarvāstivāda school has of the Theravāda analysis of the composition of food focuses on the characteristic *rūpa* on the ground that *rūpa* does not nourish our bodies. The *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* disputes the Theravāda viewpoint of the colours and shapes (*rūpa*) as a characteristic of food by saying that shapes and colours in the matter *āyatana*⁹⁹ satisfy neither our hunger¹⁰⁰ nor damage nor benefit our bodies.¹⁰¹ Therefore, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* concludes that colours and shapes (*rūpa*) are not essential constituents of food and that only these three constituents, smell (*gandha*), taste (*rasa*) and touch (*phoṭṭhabba*), are essential to the function or nature of food.¹⁰² In other words, in the place of the *visible* form understanding of *rūpa* in the Theravāda interpretation of the objective quality of food, the Sarvāstivāda treatise has *phoṭṭhabba*, *tangible* qualities, which focus on physicality. Each tradition has taken a different one of the two key meanings of *rūpa*.

As mentioned above, the first two of the constituents of food, fragrance and taste, are both accepted as essential properties by these two Buddhist schools. It is these two properties that are most implicated in binding living beings to the Sphere of Desire, and therefore take us from the objective to the subjective aspects of food as portrayed in the *Aggañña Sutta*

⁹⁸ Vism. p.341.

⁹⁹ This means that the five factors of the *āyatanas*: colours & shapes, sound, smell, taste and touch.

¹⁰⁰ T. XXIX. p. 510a.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* p. 510a-b.

¹⁰² T. XXIX. p. 510a-b.

According to the aforementioned *Apidamo shunzhengli lun*, the Sthaviravāda (so including the early Theravāda) school has an opinion that visual colour and shape (*rūpa*) could grow and benefit human bodies and sustain human lives. However, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* criticizes the fault of this viewpoint of the Sthaviravāda school. This Sarvāstivāda text says that not every material *āyatana* has the characteristic and function of food which make our bodies grow and is beneficial.¹⁰³ This text states that to mention ‘colours and shapes’ in food is not to mention the essence (*ti*, 體, *bhāva*) of food but the virtue (*de*, 德, *guṇa*) of food.¹⁰⁴

To understand what is meant here we have to step back and see the *Aggañña Sutta* in terms of the broader Buddhist cosmology which understands the universe to be divided into three basic realms, the highest being the Realm of Formlessness, the next being the Realm of Form and the lowest being the Realm of Desire. When the earth develops a crust, the world is shifting into a lower realm, that of form. When beings in the *Aggañña Sutta* experience desire they descend into a lower realm. Beings in the top realm are formless, beings in the middle realm have form but experience no desire and are not engaged in sensual pleasures. Desire and sensual pleasures are the subjective and objective meanings of the term *kāma*, desire. We find that, in analyses of food in relation to these realms, both of the objective qualities of senses and of food that can form the basis of the subjective response put here in terms of pleasure, are absent of the Realm of Desire.

Sense organs	Sense objects	consciousness
Eye (<i>cakkhu- dhātu</i>)	Visual shapes/colours (<i>rūpa - dhātu</i>)	Eye-consciousness (<i>cakkhu- viññāṇa dhātu</i>)
Ear (<i>sota-</i>)	Sounds (<i>sadda-</i>)	Ear-consciousness (<i>sota-</i>)
Nose (<i>ghāṇa-</i>)	Smells (<i>gandha-</i>)	Nose-consciousness (<i>Ghana-</i>)
Tongue (<i>jivhā-</i>)	Tastes (<i>rasa-</i>)	Tongue-consciousness (<i>jivha-</i>)

¹⁰³ T. XXIX. p. 510c.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* p. 510b.

Body (<i>kāya</i> -)	Touch (<i>phoṭṭhabba</i> -)	Body-consciousness (<i>kaya</i> -)
Mind (<i>mano</i> -)	Mental objects (<i>dhamma</i> -)	Mind-consciousness (<i>mano</i> -)

Table 1.1. The Eighteen Elements

The Eighteen Elements are the most detailed classification of what exist in inner and outer world even if they are temporary. The *Apidamojush lun* (*Abhidharma kośa-bhāṣya*, 阿毘達磨俱舍論) explains that the Smell element (*gandha-dhātu*) and Taste element (*rasa-dhātu*) and their corresponding two consciousnesses, Nose-consciousness element (*Ghana-viññāṇa dhātu*) and Tongue-consciousness element (*jivha-viññāṇa dhātu*) have the characteristics of the Realm of Desire. The essence of food is defined by these two factors, smell and taste in the Pāli and Sarvāstivāda schools and therefore, food can be defined as the object which has most serious characteristics of the Realm of Desire.

Volume 2 of the *Apidamojush lun* (*Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, 阿毘達磨俱舍論), which belongs to the Sarvāstivāda school and is dated at about 4th century C.E., summarises the view that the fragrance and taste of food have the nature of the Sphere of Desire as follows:

There are the 18 *dhātus* in the Realm of Desire.

There are the 14 *dhātus* in the Realm of Form,

(Because) smell and taste and their two consciousnesses are included only in the Realm of Desire.

In the Realm of Formless, there are the three [consciousness, mind and *dhamma dhātus*].¹⁰⁵

Here, then, in the highest realm, the Realm of Formlessness, there is only mind and concomitant aspects of mind, no forms, so all the constituents of form and the concomitant senses are missing. We have only mind, mentality and mental objects. In the middle realm, the Realm of Form, smell and taste are absent, and this is because of their associations with the Realm of Desire.

¹⁰⁵ T. XXIX, p. 7b.

The exclusion of smell (*gandha*) and taste (*rasa*) and their two consciousnesses from the Realm of Form suggests that they are particularly associated with the generation of desire, so only pertain to the Realm of Desire.

This brings us from the objective aspect of food to investigate the subjective aspect, by which I mean the psychological response to food. The Pāli commentarial text, the *Visuddhimagga* explicitly states the perilous nature of material food (*kabaḷikāra āhāra*):

“when there is food, there is greed, there is delight and there is craving.”¹⁰⁶

That food causes greed and craving which are frequently mentioned throughout Buddhist literature. For example, the *Jātaka* include a number of stories on the perils of the taste of food. In one, an ascetic who indulges in the taste of meat, in order to satisfy his desire for it, tries to kill a lizard who is the *bodhisatta*.¹⁰⁷ In another, a Buddhist monk liked a particular food in his childhood; a woman continues to give him some of it, to entice him to abandon his monkhood – his mother had promised to give the woman the family home if she made the monk abandon his monkhood. When the woman does not appear to give him his favorite food any more, he visits her house and enters her room. Having heard the whole story of why she gave him the favorite food from his childhood, he abandons his monkhood on account of the craving for his favorite childhood food.¹⁰⁸ (See Chapter 2). In the first case, the indulgence in the taste of food destroys the protagonist’s morality and in the second it causes him to abandon his renunciation and return to lay life.

Chapter 30 of the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* also says that food is the cause of craving. This Abhidharma text of the Sarvāstivāda school goes on to explain the process by which craving for food is generated:

¹⁰⁶ Vism. p. 341.

¹⁰⁷ *Jātaka*. No. 138.

¹⁰⁸ *Jātaka*. No. 14.

Pleasant feeling is generated through food. Cravings can be created through the pleasant feeling.

When cravings are already generated, people become attached [to food] and treat the [source of the] cravings as a necessity of life.¹⁰⁹

The existence of food has always the potential to cause greed and craving for food.

The description in the *Aggañña Sutta* shows these processes of the craving in detail:

Then (on one such occasion) an earth-essence spread out on the waters. It appeared in the same way as (does) the spreading out (of skin) on top of boiled milk-rice as it cools down. It had colour, smell and taste; its colour was like sweet ghee or cream, its taste like fine clear honey.

Then, monks, a certain being, greedy by nature, thinking ‘what can this be?’ tasted the earth-essence with his finger. As he tasted the earth-essence with his finger he was pleased, and craving came upon him. Other beings imitated that being, tasting the earth-essence with their finger(s). They too were pleased, and craving came upon them. Then, monks, these beings started to eat the earth-essence taking (big) mouthfuls of it with their hands.¹¹⁰

This paragraph identifies the presence of food as a factor in the creation of craving, as a stimulant for craving. It also links the process of becoming attached to eating and that of indulging in the taste of food through eating.

As the *Visuddhimagga* asserted (above), the existence of food itself could cause greed or craving, but generally speaking, the craving for food only develops as a result of eating food. The *Aggañña Sutta* states that the beings at the beginning of the universe had a craving for food, both for its taste and its quantity and as a result, the physical world began to be created.¹¹¹ The Chinese equivalent to the Pāli *Aggañña Sutta*, the *Shiji jing* (世記經) in the *Dīrgha Āgama*, says that the beings who consumed more became ugly and the beings who ate less became handsome. Thus, a distinction

¹⁰⁹ T. XXIX, p. 513a.

¹¹⁰ Collins 1993: 341-342.

¹¹¹ DN. III, pp. 85-86.

is drawn between the beings at the beginning of the universe on the basis of how much they indulged in their craving for food.¹¹² The food in the *Aggañña sutta* has characteristics which cause indulgence. The resulting greed is regarded as the cause of the creation of the world.¹¹³ The taste of food could not be separated from the amount of food and the *Aggañña sutta* also emphasises controlling the amount and taste of food.

1-5. The relationship between food and lust

The *Aggañña Sutta* states that the differentiating characteristics of the sexes, i.e. male and female sexual organs, and feelings of lust were a consequence of participation in eating by early living beings. We shall return to the association between food and sex in both brahmanical and Buddhist writing in Chapter 2. Here I want to focus on the specifics of how the *Aggañña Sutta* connects the two. Before mentioning the origination of sex organs, the *sutta* describes the consistent deterioration of the quality of the food of these early beings as a result of their greed. The appearance of rice in the sequence of foods causes a new stage of deterioration in beings, namely, the origination of the sex organs:

Then, monks, when the creeper had disappeared, there appeared for those beings rice, growing without cultivation; it was without powder, (already) husked, sweet-smelling and ready to eat. Whatever they gathered in the evening for their evening meal, in the morning had grown back ripe again; whatever they gathered in the morning for their morning meal, in the evening had grown ripe again: (the work of) harvesting was unknown. Those beings, monks, spent a long time eating the rice which grew without cultivation, living on it as their food. According to how (much) these beings ate, so to an even greater degree did their bodies become hard, and good and bad looks become known. The female parts appeared in a woman, and the male parts in a

¹¹² T. I. p. 148a.

¹¹³ DN. III. pp. 85-88.

man; the woman looked at the man with intense and excessive longing, as did the man at the woman. As they were looking at each other with intense longing passion arose in them, and burning came upon their bodies; because of this burning, they had sex. When the (other) beings saw them having sex, some threw earth (at them), some threw ashes, other cow-dung, (saying) “Away with you and your impurity, away with you and your impurity!” “How could a being do such a thing to another being?”¹¹⁴

The *sutta* says that the origination of the sex organs was the result of consuming rice over a long period. In order to see how the origination of sexual differences between men and women was understood by Buddhist schools, we can look at the classification of material food in early canonical texts and in later treatises of the Sarvāstivāda school and the Mahāyāna tradition.

In the *Aggañña Sutta* beings at the beginning of the universe consumed rapture (P: *pīti*, C: *huanxi*, 歡喜) as food, but in the course of time they started to ingest material food (the flavoursome earth) instead of rapture. This made their state deteriorate and they fell from the state of the Realm of Form to that of the Realm of Desire. The *Aggañña Sutta* does not explain the exact reason why these beings needed to consume material food, but the *Shiji jing* (世記經) in the Chinese *Dīrgha Āgama* provides a clue as to the reason why the beings in the beginning of the universe had this need.¹¹⁵

After a very long period, this world begins to expand again. At a time of expansion, the beings, when their merits, karma and life span are exhausted, pass away from the *Ābbassarā* heaven and are reborn in this world. These are births by transformation (Sk: *upapāduka*; P: *opapātika*), feeding on delight, self-luminous and moving through the air.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Collins 1993: 343-344.

¹¹⁵ The *Aggañña sutta* does not provide full statements on food we have examined in Buddhist cosmology, and the Pāli commentarial texts also do not furnish decent explanations for food classifications. That is the reason turning to treatises translated into Chinese to investigate these aspects of food in the beginning of the universe.

¹¹⁶ T. I. p. 145a.

This text states that these first beings have fallen down into the Realm of Desire from the Realm of Form, the *Ābbassarā* heaven, due to the exhaustion of the previous merit, karma and life span that had placed them in the Realm of Form. While in the Realm of Form, they live on *pīti*, rapture. Once in the Realm of the Desire, they are destined to consume material food. Initially, during the earliest stages of their time in the Realm of Desire, they temporarily continue to live on *pīti*, rapture, like beings in the Realm of Form through the remnant of the merit that had placed them in the Realm of Form. Then, once that merit was exhausted, they ate material food. We shall look at the implications of the subsequent change in food upon their physical form shortly.

The *Aggañña Sutta* mentions the gradual deterioration of the state of food from rapture to rice and, as a result of that, the origination of sexual organs. However, the *sutta* does not have a detailed explanation for the change in the quality of food and why this deterioration of the quality of food leads to the development of sexual organs.

Later canonical and commentarial texts use particular terms for the quality of food, subtle food and coarse food, to classify it. These terms are also useful indicators of the understanding of the relationship between food and sexual organs, as we will see later. First of all, we will examine the state of food conceptually in the later treatise, the *Apidamojush lun* (*Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*). According to it, we could classify the state of food in the *Aggañña Sutta* as follows:

The Realm of Desire (<i>kāmadhātu</i>)	1. Subtle food: flavoury earth → flavour fungus → <i>badālatā</i> creeper.
	2. Coarse food: wild rice.
The Realm of Form (<i>rūpadhātu</i>)	There is no material food. Rapture and pleasure are considered as food

Table 1.2. The classification of the state of food in the *Aggañña sutta*¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷T. XXIX. p. 65b-c.

The *Apidamojush lun* explicitly classifies the state of food in the *Aggañña Sutta*.

According to the text, the three types of material food that beings ate before the appearance of wild rice are forms of subtle food, but wild rice is a coarse food. Then, what are the essential differences between the subtle food and the coarse food?

According to the classification of the *Apidamojush lun*, there are two stages to the change of the state of food in the *Aggañña sutta*:

(1) Before the advent of wild rice:

The beings in this stage of the universe live on ‘savory earth (the first food material)’, ‘fungus (the second food material)’, and a kind of creeper,’ *badālatā* (the third food material)’ in turn and these foods are classified as the ‘Subtle Material Food.’ This food does not cause excretion and there is no division of male and female among the beings.¹¹⁸

(2) After the advent of wild rice:

The beings in this stage of the universe live on the wild rice and this rice is categorized as the ‘Coarse Material Food.’ After consumption of this new coarse food, the excretory organs for discharging the waste of digested coarse food are generated within the bodies of the universe’s early beings. It also causes the creation of male and female genitals and, in turn, lust is brought about.¹¹⁹

The *Apidamojush lun* defines the fundamental difference between the subtle food and coarse food as whether or not the food produces bodily waste products. This bodily

¹¹⁸ T. XXIX. p. 65b.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 65c

waste is important in that it is closely related to the production of sexual organs, as we shall explore further below.

Is this definition for the state of food from the *Apidamojush lun* generally held by the various Buddhist schools? We will examine more cases from other texts. Returning to the classification of food in the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* of the Sarvāstivāda school, we find the following categories.

The Realm of Desire (<i>kāmadhātu</i>)	1. Coarse material food For beings such as human beings, animals and so on in the Realm of Desire, except for the 5 beings mentioned in the subtle material food.
	2. Subtle material food For ‘Intermediate beings between death and rebirth (中有)’ ¹²⁰ whose food is fragrance, <i>devas</i> in the Realm of Desire, the beings in the beginning of the universe, tiny insects and new-born babies.
The Realm of Form (<i>rūpadhātu</i>)	There is neither coarse nor subtle material food.
The Realm of Formless (<i>arūpadhātu</i>)	There is neither coarse and nor subtle material food.

Table 1.3. The classification of food in the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* ¹²¹

The text mentions that the difference between the subtle and the coarse food derives from whether or not bodily waste products from food are produced. About the subtle food it states “it does not change into a filthy state and flows into the parts of the body as oil permeates through sand.”¹²²

We see here that the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* has an identical definition for the state of food to that of the *Apidamojush lun*. Interestingly, there is the further information about the ‘Intermediate beings between death and rebirth’. These ‘Intermediate beings between death and rebirth’ are well known in the *Abhidharma*

¹²⁰ The intermediate beings between death and rebirth (中有) will be discussed in detail below in the main text.

¹²¹ T. XXIX. p. 509c

¹²² *Ibid.*

and the texts of the Mind Only school. In Buddhism, the implantation of the Intermediate beings in the womb of their mother is the start of life of a baby.

Here, the Intermediate beings are considered as beings in the Realm of Desire and they are defined as pure beings who consume fragrance as food, food which does not produce bodily waste products. The fragrance is a material *āyatana* and is considered to be an essential constituent of food in the Realm of Desire.¹²³

We now turn to the Mahāyāna definition of the state of food and investigate the definition between the subtle and the coarse food from the *Yuqie shidi lun* (the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, 瑜伽師地論).

The Realm of Desire (<i>kāmadhātu</i>)	1. Coarse material food For human beings, animals and Hungry Ghosts
	2. Subtle material food For embryos and the six heavenly beings in the Realm of Desire. (Food is absorbed into their bodies in order to build their bodily parts: it is completely digested and there are no waste products.)
The Realm of Form (<i>rūpadhātu</i>)	There is neither Coarse nor Subtle material food.
The Realm of Formless (<i>arūpadhātu</i>)	There is neither Coarse nor Subtle material food.

Table 1.4. The classification of food in the *Yuqie shidi lun*¹²⁴

In the *Yuqie shidi lun*, bodily waste products are essentially the standard criterion through which the text distinguishes between subtle and coarse food: subtle food does not produce waste products, is completely digested and produces bodily parts.

Frances Garrett (below), a scholar of Tibetan Buddhist medicine, terms the three beings 1) the heavenly beings, 2) the beings in Hell and 3) the Hungry Ghosts, as ‘religiously made-up’ beings. In contrast, the embryos draw our attention because

¹²³ T. XXIX. p. 510a

¹²⁴ T. XXX. p. 300a.

they are defined as the beings who live on the subtle material food unlike the human beings who consume the Coarse material food, yet cannot be classified as ‘religiously made-up’, as Garrett puts it. In order to understand a bit more about the difference between Subtle and Coarse food and sexual organs, I shall look at the commentarial period’s understanding of the embryo and how it feeds.

The *Sāratthappakāsinī*, a fifth century text from Sri Lanka, states that “the navel of the foetus is connected with the membrane of the abdomen of the mother by a tube which is as hollow as the stem of a blue lotus. Through this tube, nutrients flow in continuously to nourish the foetus.”¹²⁵ Gunawardana points out that this understanding, that the umbilical tube provides nutrition from the mother, is a development on the pre-existing understanding that “whatsoever is consumed by the mother by drinking, eating or licking goes into the *kalala* (foetus) and helps the growth of the one that has come there.”¹²⁶

Garrett suggests that embryology might be thought of more fundamentally ‘religious’ than scientific in nature even by medical authors.¹²⁷ This highlights that there was a distinction made in applying medical doctrine in Tibetan Buddhist medicine between embryos prior to birth and human beings after it; this attitude could explain why Buddhist cosmology categorizes human entities similarly.

Even though the distinction between embryos and humans once they have been born may be more marked in Tibetan Buddhist medicine and Buddhist cosmology, medical scholarship today also observes that embryos have a different method of uptake of nutrition and a different system of elimination of waste products from fully formed humans. It explains that from around the fifth week, an embryo

¹²⁵ Gunawardana 1984–85: 14.

¹²⁶ *Ibid*: 15.

¹²⁷ Garrett 2008: 64.

consumes nutrition and disposes of his waste through the umbilical cord connected with the placenta of the mother.¹²⁸

In respect of this, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* states that it is a ‘new-born baby (嬰兒)’ who consumes subtle material food, whereas the *Yuqie shidi lun* mentions that it is the embryo who consumes the subtle material food. Given that Buddhist medical traditions shown in the *Sāratthappakāsinī*, the commentary of the *Samyuttanikāya* and in Tibetan medical physiology distinguish post-birth humans from embryos, it seems that the remark on ‘new-born baby’ in the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* is an anomaly since a baby is elsewhere regarded as already having the same bodily constituents as adults.

As we have seen above, the *Aggañña Sutta*, the *Apidamojush lun*, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* in the Sarvāstivāda school and the *Yuqie shidi lun* in the Mahāyāna have identical definitions of the state of food, but there is different definition in the *Quishijing* (起世經), which is different version of the *Shiji jing* (世記經) from the Chinese *Dīrgha Āgamas* and is the equivalent to the Pali *Aggañña Sutta*:

The Realm of Desire (kāmadhātu)	1. Coarse material food a. For human beings: rice, powder of barley, bean, fish and meat. b. For six heavenly gods (<i>asura</i> , the four great heavenly kings, the thirty-three gods, <i>yāma</i> god, <i>tusita</i> god, <i>nimmānaratī</i> god and <i>parinimmita-vasavatti</i> god): heavenly drink, <i>sudhā</i> (Sk. <i>sudhā</i> , 須陀). c. For <i>nāga</i> , <i>garuḍa</i> and so on: fishes, terrapins, alligators, toads, young dragons without a horn, snakes, otters and <i>kimbila</i> (Sk. <i>kumbhira</i> , 金毗羅).
	2. Subtle material food a. For humans, the six heavenly gods and the <i>nāga</i> , <i>garuḍa</i> and so on: covering body with clothes, massaging, washing, bathing, wiping body and rubbing oils into the skin are taken as Subtle food.
The Realm of Form (rūpadhātu)	There is neither Coarse nor Subtle material food.
The Realm of Formless	There is neither Coarse nor Subtle material food. As do the beings in the Sphere of Formless, beings in hell take consciousness as

¹²⁸ Webster et al. 2012: 16.

(arūpadhātu)	food.
--------------	-------

Table 1.5. the Classification of food in the *Quishi jing* (起世經)¹²⁹

The *Quishi jing* also categorizes material food as either Subtle food and Coarse food, but has a different understanding from the above-mentioned texts as to who it is that consumes those two foods. The Subtle food in the *Quishijing* does not mean material food as we would understand it, but includes kinds of treatment, such as massaging, rubbing oil and so on. These remind us of the typical *Ayurvedic* medical treatments such as massage and oil treatments in that massaging or the application of oil influence the function of our body. Oils from plants and animals for massage are used to improve people's health.¹³⁰ What distinguishes the definition in the *Quishi jing* is that it considers as material food those things used to promote physical well being.

As we have seen earlier, the *Aggañña Sutta* states that sexual organs are developed after the point at which coarse food starts to be consumed. As the *Apidamojush lun* mentions, coarse food causes bodily waste products and the bodily waste products require excretory organs. These excretory organs, for passing urine and faeces, are closely connected to the sexual organs, emptying through closely connected external orifices. This signifies that, with the exception of the *Quishijing* which accommodates a greater range of substances under material food, the texts we have examined, namely the Pāli *Aggañña sutta*, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* in the Sarvāstivāda school and the *Yuqie shidi lun* in the Mahāyāna provide the connection between eating coarse food, the need to excrete waste products, the appearance of sexual organs, lust and sexuality. This suggests that lust is ultimately caused by food or eating and these two factors are intertwined.

¹²⁹ T. I. p. 345c.

¹³⁰ Wujastyk 1998: 139-140.

The relationship between food and lust has significant meaning in the sense of the religious practice. The *Chengshi lun* (the *Satyasiddhi śāstra*, 成實論) which some conjecture is a treatise of the Sautrāntika school clearly shows this practical respect:

When eating the first food, savoury earth, the beings, who ate much food, lost their radiance. Thus, ageing, diseases and death come in sequence. There are various types of suffering as we get older and start to approach the age of 100. Due to our craving for food, we are disadvantaged. Therefore, we should completely understand the nature of food. Thanks to the craving for food, lust is generated and from lust, various forms of mental suffering are produced. From various forms of mental suffering, unwholesome *karmas* are committed. From unwholesome *karmas*, the Three evil spheres¹³¹ expand and damage heavenly beings and humans.¹³² Thus, physical damage and mental suffering are both a consequence of the craving for food. Ageing, diseases and death are also caused by food. Beings' primary cravings are for food. Even though it is said that lust puts beings in trouble, it does not torment beings as much as food does.¹³³

This treatise states in detail the defilements which are caused by gluttony and by its derivative, lust, and concludes that all these unwholesome desires are essentially derived from the craving for food.

1-6. The relationship between human conduct and nature

The *Aggañña Sutta* and equivalent texts in Pali and in Chinese state that through unwholesome actions, the quality of nature and the quality of human beings deteriorate. Immorality is the most significant issue in dealing with the varying condition of nature and of human beings in Buddhist cosmology. This section

¹³¹ The Three Evil realms: Hell, Hungry Ghost and Animal realms.

¹³² These two, human and heavenly beings, make the total of five with the beings of hell, hungry ghosts and animal realms.

¹³³ T. XXXII. pp. 348c-349a.

examines in turn nature, life span, and the bodies of human beings in relation to food, with the purpose of making clear the relationships between them.

First of all, let us look at the deterioration of the state of nature. The *Shiji jing* (世記經) describes nature in its ideal state as follows:

- 1) The soil is soft and when treading the soil, the soil drops down and when lifting up the feet, the soil rises up again. The soil is even and there are no ups and downs in the surface.
- 2) Water is clean and pure and free from contamination.
- 3) There are no ditches, pits, thorns and stumps.
- 4) There are no mosquitoes, gadflies, poisonous snakes, wasps, scorpions, tigers and leopards, in other words, no aggressive animals.
- 5) There are no stones and sands, but just gems.
- 6) The two principles in nature are harmonious, the four energies are balanced,¹³⁴ weather is neither cold nor hot and there is neither suffering nor hardship.¹³⁵

As well as the ideal state of the natural world, the ideal state of food, as found at the beginning of the universe, is depicted as follows:

In this world, there is rice which grows spontaneously, without husk. It resembles a white bouquet and has various flavours like the food of the *Tāvatiṃsa* heaven. There are rice cauldrons which appear spontaneously. There is also a precious bead called 'light of flame' which makes rice cook. When the rice is ready to eat, then the light of the flame is extinguished. Therefore, there is no need to collect firewood and to make the effort to cook food...¹³⁶

All the people can eat their fill. The rice does not disappear unless the master gets up and when the master gets up, the rice disappears. The rice is clean and pure and is like a white

¹³⁴ T. I. p. 118a. *Yin yan Tiao rou Siqi he shun* (陰陽調柔 四氣和順). These are typical phrases in Chinese philosophy and traditional Chinese medical theory. *Yin-yang* (陰陽) are two principles into which all things in the universe are divided. For example, the Yin means female; Yang, male among human beings and animals; Yin means winter, Yang, summer. The four energies (*SiQi*, 四氣) mean coldness, coolness, warmth and hotness. These are the principles of nature and the human body. See the traditional Chinese medical text, the *Huang-di-nei-jing* (黃帝內經), I. Questions, Chapter II. Unschuld, P.U., Tessenow, Hermann and Zheng Jiusheng 2011: 45-58.

¹³⁵ T. I. p. 118a.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

bouquet. The rice has all the tastes as the food of *Tāvatiṃsa* and when this rice is consumed, all diseases disappear, people have great vigour, their countenances are peaceful and bright, and they are neither debilitated nor emaciated. The figures of the people in the world, in the continent of *Jambudīpa*, are similar to one another, their physiques and faces are too similar to be distinguishable and they look young as if in their twenties.¹³⁷

The initial utopian qualities of the natural world and of food deteriorated as a result of immorality. The *Shiji jing* (世記經) makes this point explicitly:

When people frequently conduct themselves unrighteously, and hold wicked and perverse views, when their behavior is that of the ten unwholesome actions, then, even though it still rains on the earth, the grass withers and the five grains fail to ripen. There are only stalks and leaves like straw.¹³⁸

This text says that the immorality of people corrupts the ideal condition of the natural world and food, and presents the concept that the ‘Ten Unwholesome Actions (十惡業)’ accommodate all evil behaviour.¹³⁹ The text goes on to remark that the ‘Ten Unwholesome Actions’, along with a lack of respect for parents, teachers and elders,¹⁴⁰ lead to the deterioration of the quality of natural world as follows:

- 1) The world is covered all over with thorns
- 2) There are mosquitoes, gadfly, wasps, lizards, snakes everywhere
- 3) Gold, silver and crystals disappear into the soil.
- 4) There is only worthless material, such as stone and sand.
- 5) There are ditches, streams, ravines and slopes everywhere and there is no flat land at all.¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ *Ibid.* 119a.

¹³⁸ T. I. 144b.

¹³⁹ The Ten Unwholesome Actions are as follows: 1. The killing of living beings, 2. The taking of what is not given, 3. Misconduct in sensual pleasure, 4. False speech, 5. Malicious speech, 6. Harsh speech, 7. Gossip, 8. Covetousness, 9. Ill will, 10. Distorted views. This translation of the ten unwholesome actions is derived from Ñāṇamoli Bhikkhu and Bodhi Bhikkhu 1995: 248.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ T. I. p.144 a-c.

With the ‘Ten Unwholesome Actions’ and unethical behaviour, the natural world loses the utopian state of nature and becomes a place in which beings cannot live in the proper conditions. Eventually, the benefits of the natural world found at the beginning of the universe no longer exist.

The *Shiji jing* (世記經) and the *Cakkavattisihanāda Sutta* respectively define the Ten Unwholesome Actions and the breaking of the Five Precepts¹⁴² as typical evil actions which cause nature, life spans and human bodies to deteriorate in quality. A detailed discussion about this issue will be provided in the section on lifespan below.

The chapter on the ‘three middle aeons’ (*Sanzhongjiepin*, 三中劫品) in the *Shiji jing* (世記經) describes the quality of food after the deterioration of morality among beings. This text describes in detail food in a society in which the ‘Ten Unwholesome Actions’ are rampant in ways that reflect conditions of extreme hardship and starvation. This period is called ‘the aeon of starvation’:

- 1) As human beings commit wicked deeds, rain does not fall from the sky and all the grass withers. The five grains will not grow and only the stalks remain. People are expelled from their homelands and subsist on scavenged grains which are thrown in filthy soil on streets and roads. This is called ‘starvation.’
- 2) In the aeon of starvation people survive by drinking broth made from bones found in slaughter houses and graves. This is called ‘the starvation of bones.’
- 3) In the aeon of starvation, when the five grains are planted, they grow to become grass and trees. When the flowers of the grass and trees fall in this period again and they are

¹⁴² The Five Precepts are as follows:

1. I undertake not to cause the death of living beings.
2. I undertake not to take what is not given.
3. I undertake to refrain from sexual misconduct.
4. I undertake to refrain from lying.
5. I undertake to refrain from intoxicants.

Translation Crosby 2014:116.

buried under the soil, people take the flowers out of the soil and boil them to drink.

People subsist on this. This is called ‘the starvation of grasses and trees.’¹⁴³

The chapter of three middle aeons (*Sanzhongjiepin*, 三中劫品) in the *Shiji jing* (世記經) further states that beings in ‘the aeon of starvation’ fall into the Sphere of Hungry Ghosts as they are always jealous of others and greedy, they have no intention of sharing anything with others, and they do not give consideration to those in distress. This *sutta* states that immorality causes the fall of the status of human beings from the Sphere of Humans to the Sphere of Hungry Ghosts, as well as causing deterioration in the quality of food.¹⁴⁴

Among the Buddhist texts which relate to the *Aggañña Sutta*’s treatment of Buddhist cosmology, the most interesting text is probably one from the *Sāmmittiya* school.¹⁴⁵ This *Sāmmittiya* text, whose title is not known, deals with the relationship between human beings and nature (animals and plants). Plants are mentioned as a part of nature in the *Aggañña Sutta* in Pāli¹⁴⁶ and in the *Shiji jing* (世記經) in the Chinese *Dīrgha Āgama* (*Changahan jing*, 長阿含經).¹⁴⁷ In those texts, plants, at the beginning of the universe, generously and abundantly provide humans with ideal foodstuffs. The plants are depicted as passive agents in a mutual relationship between humans and nature, and no mention is made of animals. However, the *Sāmmittiya* text in its cosmology portrays things done to humans by animals and plants in reaction to human beings’ immoral behaviors.

According to Japanese scholar Okano’s translation, the contents of the

¹⁴³ T. I. p. 144 c.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 144 b-c.

¹⁴⁵ This text was one of two edited by Kiyoshi Okano in 1998, *Sarvarakṣitas Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā. Ein Sanskrit-Kāvya über die Kosmologie der Sāmmittiya Schule des Hīnayāna-Buddhismus*, Tohoku-Indo-Tibetto-Kenkyūsho-Kankokai, Monograph Series I, Sendai. Not being able to acquire this edition, I have used an article which includes a translation of the anonymous text (Okano 2002).

¹⁴⁶ DN. III. pp. 86-88.

¹⁴⁷ T. I. p. 118-119.

Sāmmittiya text are divided into the following periods:

- The time when Brahma god established the world (section 2- 7).
- The formation of the world from the Brahma World to the earth (section 8-31).
- A section which corresponds to the *Aggañña sutta* in *Dīgha Nikāya* (section 31-97).
- The continuation of the *Aggañña* cosmology (section 98-131).
- An account of the contemporary period (section 132-146).
- A description of the eventual end of the current aeon (section 147 onwards).¹⁴⁸

Of the six divisions mentioned above, the fourth ('d') is the one relevant to the discussion of nature here. This period is further classified into three stages, each of which has two sub-sections as presented in table 1.6:

Stage	Relationship	Detail	Characteristic
1	human beings and plants	Even if the taste of rice was degraded, various other food items such as barley, wheat, sesame, <i>kulattha</i> bean, <i>mudga</i> bean, <i>māṣa</i> bean appeared (section 99) and at that time, sesame and barley were juicy and sugarcane was of the best quality without skin and leaves (section 101). ¹⁴⁹	Harmony and voluntary help.
	human beings and animals	Cows both procreated and provided human beings with milk voluntarily (section 102). At that time, butter and ghee were made without human labour (section 103). After that time, elephants and horses appeared and were tamed of their own volition (section 104). ¹⁵⁰	
2	human beings and animals	As animals were worked and used for carriage, they demanded their portion from human beings. Cows no longer spontaneously provided human beings with milk, but had to be milked by human beings. ¹⁵¹	The beginning of a hostile relationship.
	human beings	Sugarcanes covered their bodies with leaves	

¹⁴⁸ Okano 2002: 78.

¹⁴⁹ Okano 2002: 80.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ *Ibid*: 81.

	and plants	(section 117) and sesame lost its juice (section 118). Thus various plants were degraded and the lifespan of human beings was also shortened. ¹⁵²	
3	human beings and animals	Thereafter, owners of fields became arrogant and did not distribute to animals their apportioned lot, and animals also did not obey human beings (section 120). Bulls were not submissive and human beings had to put rings through their noses (section 121). Animals for riding, such as horses and elephants, were not tame and had to be whipped. Therefore, these animals abhorred human beings and needed to be tied up securely (section 123). ¹⁵³	Serious antagonism between human beings and Nature (animals and plants).
	human beings and plants	Sugarcane was covered with thick skin and human beings had to squeeze it hard to get the juice. Sesame also required intense labour for the extraction of its oil. After the third stage, the world was defiled; someone who had wicked views taught people a false teaching and foodstuffs became seriously degraded. Even though human beings worked hard, it was very difficult to obtain sesame, sugarcane, milk, and grains of good quality. Human beings became accustomed to inferior food and their life spans shortened. ¹⁵⁴	

Table 1.6. The relationship between human beings and nature (plants and animals) in the *Sāmmiṭiya* text

As we can see in the table above, the text identifies a tendency, caused by human immorality, for an escalating deterioration of the relationship between human beings and nature (animals and plants). In the first stage, the harmonious and virtuous relationships between human beings and nature (animals and plants) provide human beings with food of an ideal quality and spontaneous services from plants and

¹⁵² *Ibid*: 81-82.

¹⁵³ *Ibid*: 82-83.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid*: 83.

animals. In the second state, by starting to treat animals as tools such as vehicles, human beings suffered a rift from nature and the quality of food from animals and plants increasingly deteriorated.

Discussing the continuing degradation of the relationship between humans and nature (animals and plants) in the third stage, the *Sāmmiṭiya* text concludes that immorality caused by the wicked actions of human beings leads to the deterioration of the quality of food and, subsequently, a reduction of life span. Additionally, it seems that the *Sāmmiṭiya* text interprets nature as an active agent which punishes human immorality. The increasingly hostile confrontation between human beings and nature seriously impacts on nature and on the living conditions of human beings. However, this antagonism would not necessarily be permanent as it is possible that the extreme deterioration of human food and life span might cause human beings to have a change of heart.

Let us now look at the life span of human beings in Buddhist cosmology. The *Aggañña Sutta* does not mention the life span of human beings. Therefore, in order to deal with the issue of life span, I refer to the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda sutta* in the *Dīgha Nikāya* (DN26).

As mentioned before, for the purpose of this discussion, the salient feature in this *sutta* is its statement that the shortening of human life span is related to immoral behavior. The relationship between unethical actions and a decrease of life span is stated there as shown in table 1.7:

Immorality ¹⁵⁵	Decrease of life span
Killing	from 80,000 down to 40,000 years
False speech	down to 20,000 years
Wicked words	down to 10,000 years

¹⁵⁵ The items of the ten types of unwholesome actions in the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda sutta* are different from the items of the Ten Unwholesome Actions typical in Buddhism (see note 80 above).

Sexual misconduct	down to 5,000 years
Harsh speech and gossip	down to 2,500 years, or, for some beings, just 2,000 years
Jealousy and hatred	down to 1,000 years
Wicked views	down to 500 years
Incest, greed and homosexuality	down to 250 or 200 years
No respect for parents, ascetics, Brahmins, and patriarchs	down to 100 years
Hatred, anger and thoughts of killing among family members	down to 10 years ¹⁵⁶

Table 1.7. Immorality and decrease of life span

This table shows life span reducing as immorality increases. The ten types of immorality listed here from the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda sutta* are distinct from the usual the “Ten Unwholesome Actions” and place a greater emphasis on harmonious social relationships such as respect for parents, ascetics, Brahmins, patriarchs and so on, in addition to the bodily, verbally and mentally wholesome actions.

In addition to the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda Sutta*, as seen in the *Apidamodapiposhalun* (*Mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra*, 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論) in which the ten unwholesome actions are considered as the causes of the damage of life span, human body, food and morality,¹⁵⁷ the ten unwholesome actions function as essentials in relation to the cause of the deterioration of the state of nature, food and life span.

According to the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda sutta*, once the life span of humans has shrunk to 10 years, palatable food-items such as ghee, butter, sesame oil, molasses and salt will disappear and humans will start to consume coarse grains such as *kudrūsa* as a staple food.¹⁵⁸ The immediate connection between lifespan and the state of food can be understood if we draw on further information from elsewhere. Through the

¹⁵⁶ DN. III. pp. 69-72.

¹⁵⁷ T. XXVII. p. 588 a-b.

¹⁵⁸ DN. III. p. 71.

aforementioned *Sāmmītiya* text , we can understand the order of the deterioration of the state of nature and human beings as follows:

- A. Immorality causes a deterioration of the state of nature.
- B. The damage to nature leads to the deterioration of the quality of food.
- C. The diminished quality of damaged food shortens the life span of human beings.¹⁵⁹

Elsewhere in the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda sutta* the violations of the Five Precepts are enumerated: killing, theft, telling a lie, sexual misconduct and drinking intoxicants are given as the reasons why the life span of human beings decreases. A more interesting and significant point in this part of the *sutta* is that this text adds a sixth precept, ‘the consumption of food in moderation’ at the end of the five.¹⁶⁰ Because this *sutta* explicitly states that ‘eating in moderation’ is a cause through which life span increases, it signifies that gluttony is considered as immoral and can be a direct reason for the reduction in life span.¹⁶¹

To sum up our examination of the connection in the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda Sutta* between the morality and the quality of food and lifespan, immorality is considered to be the cause of the reduction of life span and gluttony to be a form of immorality. According to this *sutta*, in order to increase our life span, we should live ethically and consume food in moderation.

Now, let us summarise the relationship between food, morality and the deterioration of the human body in Buddhist discussions of cosmology in the texts we have examined.

The *Aggañña Sutta* remarks that through food and eating, the quality of human bodies deteriorates. The *Aggañña Sutta* focuses on the direct relation between eating and the deterioration of the quality of the human body. It describes how, when beings

¹⁵⁹ Okano 2002: 83.

¹⁶⁰ DN. III. p. 63.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

first existed in this world and went on to consume a large amount of the first food, earth-essence, “their bodies become hard, and good and bad looks became known. Some beings were good-looking, others ugly: those who were good-looking despised those who were ugly.”¹⁶²

The *Aggañña sutta* states that through eating food, the human body became hard and its appearance ugly. The *Apidamojush lun* also mentions that through eating, the bodies of beings became solid and heavy.¹⁶³ On the other hand, the *Yuqie shidi lun* states that, with the corruption of morality, human bodies will shrink to the size of a hand-span.¹⁶⁴ As seen in the *Chengshi lun*, the nature of food is to be craved and therefore gluttony is an eternal peril for religious practitioners. The *Aggañña sutta*, the *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* in the Sarvāstivāda school and the Mahāyāna *Yuqie shidi lun* make a connection between food and the origin of male and female sexual organs and the consequent arousal of lust. This connection is made explicit in texts of the commentarial period by their explanations of the digestion and absorption of food in our body according to the type of food; they differ according to realm, whether in the Realm of Formlessness, Form or Desire.

All the texts examined make a close connection between the objective and subjective aspects of food, nature and human beings. Nature is partially, in the form of food, an object of craving by human beings. The desire of human beings, which they act on due to their immorality, could cause the deterioration of the quality of nature. As a result, food further deteriorates, and the process is a downward spiral. The corruption of the quality of food can subsequently lead to a shortening of life span and to making bodies inferior in both size and appearance. The level of the quality of food corresponds to the level of morality of human beings and human

¹⁶² Collins 1993: 342.

¹⁶³ T. XXIX. p. 65b.

¹⁶⁴ T. XXX. p. 286a.

morality is the decisive factor in determining the quality of nature and of human beings.

By deciding to leave a society which focuses on food storage and sexuality, along with other caste preoccupations, the renouncers in the *Aggañña Sutta*, i.e. the prototype Buddhist monks, are not only seeking to escape from this downward spiral, but – as is proposed by Collins – aspire to the greater purity of the earlier living beings of the past, who were not afflicted by craving, lust, immorality and their subsequent evils. I have shown here that the relationship between the quality of food and the physical deterioration of humans is linked through the understanding of the physical body and the distinction between coarse and subtle food. Material food causes craving. Indulging in the craving causes food to lose its subtlety. Coarse food causes waste products. Waste products require the body to have organs of excretion. These organs are associated with sexual organs. Indulgence in food thus, as a cosmological development, leads to sexuality and lust. What is also interesting is that the different food states are themselves characteristic of different realms. The Realm of Formlessness has no food. The Realm of Form has no material food. The Realm of Desire has both subtle and coarse material food. In Buddhism, these cosmological realms correspond to mental states achieved through meditation. The purified mental states, the *jhāna*, are divided into two levels, those of Form and Formlessness, and are free from the negative mental concomitants of the Realm of Desire.

1-7. Conclusion

The evidence drawn on in this chapter includes commentarial period texts in order to explain the links between food, craving, deterioration of the physical world and sexuality. In performing this analysis, I have accepted that early Buddhists *did*

take the cosmology presented in them seriously, though this does not exclude their satirical import at the same time. While it is possible to argue that some of the understandings of these connections may be a commentarial period development, it is my view that the commentaries in fact make it possible for us to understand the cosmology and physiology implicit in the *Aggañña Sutta*. I therefore take the *Aggañña Sutta* to be both an account or myth of origination and a parable. Regardless of whether the redactors of the *Aggañña Sutta* as we have it were informed by all the detail that I, on the basis of evidence dated to the commentarial period, have provided, the connections between different aspects of craving, lust and other forms of immorality and the downward spiral still apply. Moreover, the prototype monks seek to leave behind that negative state of affairs. In later chapters we shall look in more detail at the methods developed in early and commentarial period Pali texts and their parallels in Chinese, to facilitate monks in their efforts to preserve the best possible conduct in relation to food: the precepts, rules, narratives and meditation practices. In the next chapter, we shall first look more closely at the *Aggañña Sutta* as parable. As Olivelle has observed, the cosmological texts are important in shaping or authorizing the specific reactions that Indian ascetics or renouncers had to food, in contrast to their Vedic forebears, and that they inform detailed rules or vows of conduct for how, what and when ascetics may eat. As Collins discovered, the function of the *Aggañña Sutta* as parable, i.e. as a text designed to guide monks regarding appropriate behaviour, is very specific and has direct parallels with *vinaya* rules. In the next chapter, using the specifics of the *Aggañña Sutta*'s cosmogony, I want to examine how Buddhist attitudes to and rules on food vary from that of other renouncer groups.

Chapter 2

The Decision to Eat

“Food is not merely an edible object but a category of thought. ‘... It becomes identified with some primary principles and their organization for explaining the Hindu conception of the cosmos.’ Khare 1976: 131,” (Olivelle 1991: 17).

“If food is a code for the created universe, both physical and social, as it appears to be, then one’s behaviour with regard to food is a code for one’s behaviour towards the cosmos.” (Olivelle 1991: 23).

2-1. The interpretation of the *Aggañña Sutta*

The above quotations are taken from Patrick Olivelle’s ‘From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic’ (1991), where he examines the relationships between attitudes to food and the place of food in various types of Indian cosmology. He explains how they translate into different religious and social relationships with food. In the previous chapter we looked at the position of food in the *Aggañña Sutta*, the early Buddhist cosmogonic myth and parable. In analysing that *sutta*’s understanding of food and the relationship it has with other vices such as sexual lust, we found that it conformed accurately with the universal, early Buddhist cosmology that divides the universe into the Realm of Formlessness, Realm of Form and Realm of Desire. We also found that the relationship between coarse food and sexual organs could be understood in relation to medical interpretations of the physiology of digestion, evidence for which can be found in commentarial period Buddhist texts. Therefore, although I accept that the *Aggañña Sutta* is a satirical take on brahminical literature, and in particular the cosmogonic *Puruṣasūkta* *Ṛg-veda* X.90, as demonstrated by

Gombrich (1992a), I nonetheless see the account it gives of the relationship between food, craving and other vices on one hand, and the varying condition of beings and the world on the other, as being based firmly in the Buddhist cosmological worldview of the period.

Olivelle looks at both the *Aggañña Sutta* and the Hindu *Liṅgapurāṇa* in his examination of the relationship between cosmology and attitudes to food. The *Liṅgapurāṇa*, too, presents an account of the deterioration of the universe, but in terms of the four *yuga*, or ages. In several ways it shows parallels to the *Aggañña Sutta*. The similarities show how the type of response identified by Gombrich – that of a satirical overturning of the Vedic viewpoint – is found within the brahmanical tradition itself. The differences between the accounts show how the rejection of the earlier Vedic standpoint is specific to the theology or doctrine of the group that the later cosmological myth represents. In other words, the *Aggañña Sutta* and *Liṅgapurāṇa* myths of cosmogonic decline reflect their respective beliefs. They share the fundamental shift in attitude in the post-Vedic period, pointed out by Olivelle, from seeing creation as positive to seeing it as negative. Their negative cosmology correlates to renunciation's rejection of creative and communal activities, which informed both texts.¹⁶⁵ While the *Puruṣasūkta* sees creation positively, the *Liṅgapurāṇa* and *Aggañña Sutta* see it negatively.

The way the proto-renouncers of the *Aggañña Sutta* leave behind the village, and try to abandon the effort and vices of human society, is seen by Olivelle in terms of “the post-Vedic conception of reality [in which] ... *Pravṛtti* signifies ... the sustained existence of the cosmos. It connotes action, especially ritual action. *Nivṛtti* signifies the opposite, namely, the reversal of the cosmic processes ... It connotes non-action

¹⁶⁵ Olivelle 1991: 29.

and total quietude.”¹⁶⁶ For renouncers who are seeking to avoid the continuation in *saṃsāra*, aspects of *pravṛtti* must be avoided. As Olivelle points out food is “a central element of *pravṛtti*.”¹⁶⁷ This, then explains the overall attitude to food among the Indian renouncer traditions: food, as part of *pravṛtti*, is to be avoided. However, in the *Liṅga Purāṇa*, according to Olivelle, “Eating itself is not identified here as a cause of the fall. But it is portrayed as one step in the gradual deterioration of the cosmos because in the very beginning there was neither food nor the need for eating.”¹⁶⁸ In the context of the cosmogonic myth of the *Liṅga Purāṇa* the respective paradisaical state to which renouncers should aspire is one free from food. In contrast, one of the interesting parallels between *Ṛg-veda* X.90 and the *Aggañña Sutta* not noted by other scholars is that the *Aggañña Sutta* does not appear to challenge the *Ṛg-veda* categorization of all existence into that which eats and that which does not eat.¹⁶⁹ There is no questioning in the *Aggañña Sutta* that beings eat: before they eat material and coarse food in the Realm of Desire, they eat immaterial food, *pīti* or rapture. Another difference Olivelle points out between the Buddhist and Hindu texts is that in the latter the process of deterioration is an automatic part of the *yuga* cycle, even if exacerbated by greed, whereas in the Buddhist texts, it is human action that is the cause of the deterioration. Human immorality in relation to food leads directly to sexual immorality.

This understanding of food informs the *Aggañña Sutta* as parable, i.e. Collins reading of the text. In the previous chapter I explained how I see the text as a parable for monastic conduct. When the archetypal renouncers in the *sutta* give up village life, they do not stop eating entirely, but cease their involvement in the production and storage of food. The corresponding *vinaya* rules determine how one eats, and, in spite

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid*: 32.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid*: 33.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid*: 31.

¹⁶⁹ *Ṛg-veda* X.90. 4, see Olivelle 1995b: 368.

of the association of food with craving, sex and other vices, do not proscribe eating. The connection between food and sex in Indian religions ties in with Olivelle's analysis of *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* above, and finds different expression in different Indian traditions. For example, in the earliest Upaniṣads, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Chandogya Upaniṣads*, we find sex associated with food through the symbolism of the human body as the ritual sacrifice. This is an extension of the theme underlying the *Puruṣa Sūkta*, but moving towards the 'internalisation' of ritual that sees its culmination in the internalization of the sacred fire and ritual action in Hindu asceticism, but in Buddhism in the ethicisation of action.¹⁷⁰ The *Upanisadic* passage reads:

“Man, Gautama, is in fact a fire. ... In that very fire gods offer food. Semen springs from that oblation. Woman, Gautama, is in fact a fire. ... In that very fire gods offer semen. The fetus springs from that oblation.”¹⁷¹

In this Upanishadic context, fires, sacrificial ritual, food and the having of offspring are being affirmed.¹⁷² In Buddhism all these elements are viewed negatively. We see an echo of such passages, indeed, in the first *Vinaya* rule, which prohibits monks from sexual intercourse. The text again satirizes the Vedic view, this time the Vedic view of the *yoni*, vagina, as a firepit in the sacrificial sense: the text takes the view literally: to place one's penis in a *yoni* is to place it in a firepit. The rejection of aspects of *pravṛtti*, such as fire, ritual sacrifice, sexual intercourse and the importance of progeny, is visible in the *Aggañña Sutta* in the renunciators' rejection of typical village conduct and making fires.

Olivelle points to a dichotomy between Vedic-based and renouncer-based attitudes to food in which the enlightened person is “either a person for whom

¹⁷⁰ Collins 1993.

¹⁷¹ BAU 6.2.12-13; CU, 5.7-8, cited Olivelle 1995b: 373.

¹⁷² Elsewhere the same *Upaniṣad* relegates the importance of progeny below knowledge as a means of achieving immortality, but still retains it as a means of power in the world. See Olivelle 1997.

everything is food (Vedic paradigm) or a person who does not need, and is therefore beyond the realm of food.”¹⁷³ The complete rejection of food was one option for renouncers, one taken by some Hindu renouncers. Olivelle notes the classification of forest hermits in the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* (mid 2 century B.C–beginning of the common era)¹⁷⁴ includes “those who subsist only on water” and “those who subsist only on air”¹⁷⁵, yet, as we have seen, the archetypal Buddhist renouncers do not reject food in its entirety, only its production and storage.

Khare, who has written extensively on food in Indian culture, observes that, “Foods for the Hindus represent essentially two interrelated dimensions – as a nutriment for remaining alive and as a cultural principle of cosmological creation.”¹⁷⁶ As noted, some Hindu renouncers, in seeking to disengage from cosmological creation, rejected food completely, their greater ability to do so being a mark of their status as ascetics. Among the still extant renouncer traditions, Jainism has the strongest emphasis on eliminating food: “The Jaina example of fasting unto death is clearly linked to the perception that food is the final link of a person to the world.”¹⁷⁷ However, a debate emerged between the two main branches of Jainism, the *Digambaras* and *Śvetambaras*. For the *Digambaras*, an enlightened person cannot feel hunger or be dependent on food.¹⁷⁸ However, according to the *Śvetambaras*, an enlightened person does eat and, “nothing about eating and hunger... is

¹⁷³ Olivelle 1995b: 376.

¹⁷⁴ Olivelle introduces P.V. Kane’s date of the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* (500-200 BCE) and carefully mentions his own dating of the text as the time period from mid-2 century BCE to the beginning of the common era (Olivelle 1999: xxxi-xxxiii). I follow Olivelle’s date of the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*.

¹⁷⁵ Olivelle 1991: 25

¹⁷⁶ Khare 1976b: 119, cited Olivelle 1995b: 369.

¹⁷⁷ Olivelle 1995b: 376.

¹⁷⁸ Dundas 1985: 168. This option also became possible in Mahāyāna Buddhism as the level of Docetism increased with the development of the *trikāya* doctrine, i.e. that the teaching body of the Buddha was a magical creation.

fundamentally at variance with the attainment of omniscience.”¹⁷⁹ The difference between these attitudes to food reflects a divergence in the understanding of the nature of an enlightened being and its interaction with the universe, with the *Digambara* view about eating being part of a spectrum of ways in which the post-Enlightenment *Jina* does not participate in the world. In the *Aggañña Sutta*, the cause of deterioration is craving. In accepting the presence of food in realms above the Realm of Desire, Buddhist cosmology posits the notion of eating without craving. This is reflected in the biography of the Buddha: initially he tries the elimination of food, but rejects such extreme fasting as unhelpful, as we shall examine next. After examining the story of his rejection of asceticism, I want to examine how early and commentarial Buddhism negotiated between the act of eating and the perils of eating; what was valued and what was rejected in food and food culture, how Buddhism’s distinctive approach to food among early Indian renouncer traditions was shaped.

2-2. The rejection of extreme fasting

The Buddha’s rejection of fasting and the stance on food that he advocates can be found in the *Mahāsaccaka Sutta* in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (no. 36). In this *sutta*, the Buddha explains the result of his former extreme ascetic practices to Saccaka, a Jain follower:

But by this racking practice of austerities I have not attained any superhuman states, any distinction in knowledge and vision worthy of the noble ones. Could there be another path to enlightenment?’¹⁸⁰

The Buddha states that even though he practised austerities entailing severe intake-reduction, these ascetic practices were not conducive to his obtaining the mental facilities that contribute to or arise at the moment of enlightenment, such as

¹⁷⁹ Dundas 1985: 177.

¹⁸⁰ Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 220.

superhuman states, distinctive knowledge and vision. In the 12th *sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta*, the Buddha mentions various ascetic practices which he practised before his enlightenment.¹⁸¹ Like the Hindu texts discussed by Olivelle (1991), these texts, while not being evidence direct from the traditions to which such practices may have belonged, give us some indication of ascetic practices before or during the early Buddhist period. They offer information about the various ascetic practices concerning diet, clothing and accommodation of different religious groups. Here, we enumerate those ascetic practices that relate to food:

Taste	Quantity and frequency
1. Not accepting fish	1. Keeping to one house, one morsel
2. Not accepting meat	2. Keeping to two houses, two morsels
3. Drinking no liquor	3. Keeping to seven houses, seven morsels
4. Drinking no wine	4. Subsist on one saucer full a day
5. Drinking no fermented brew	5. Subsist on two saucers full a day
6. Consuming greens	6. Subsist on seven saucers full a day
7. Consuming millet	7. Consuming food once a day
8. Consuming wild rice	8. Consuming food once every two days
9. Consuming hide-parings	9. Consuming food once every seven days
10. Consuming moss	10. Consuming food once every fortnight
11. Consuming rice-bran	
12. Consuming rice-scum	
13. Consuming sesame flour	
14. Consuming grass	
15. Consuming cow dung	
16. Consuming forest roots	
17. Consuming forest fruits	

¹⁸¹ The Pāli texts and their corresponding Chinese texts mentioning ascetic practices are as follows:

DN. I. pp. 165-166 = T. I. p. 102c.

DN. I. pp. 40-41 = T. I. p. 47c.

MN. I. p. 238 = None

MN. I. 307 = T. I. p. 712b

MN. I. p. 342 = None

MN. I. p. 412 = None

AN. I. pp. 295-296 = None

Table 2.1. The Buddha-to-be's ascetic practices relating to the taste, quantity and frequency of food¹⁸²

The ascetic practices are characterized by the avoidance of alcohol and luxurious food such as fish and meat, instead consuming foods that require no cooking or preparation or that can be gleaned, such as grass, vegetables, grains, forest roots and forest fruits in terms of the taste of food. They also aim at a dramatic reduction in the volume and frequency of intake.

The Buddha explains in the *Mahāsihanāda Sutta* that there are religious groups who believe that religious purification is achieved through an extreme reduction in one's intake of food. He introduces two cases in which such practitioners perform ascetic practices involving the jujube or kola fruit and beans. This is an austere practice performed with kola fruits by an ascetic group:

They say: 'Let us live on kola-fruits,' and they eat kola fruits, they eat kola-fruit powder, they drink kola-fruit water, and they make many kinds of kola-fruit concoctions. Now I recall having eaten a single kola-fruit a day...

Through feeding on a single kola-fruit a day, my body reached a state of extreme emaciation. Because of eating so little my limbs became like the jointed segments of vine stems or bamboo stems. Because of eating so little my backside became like a camel's hoof. Because of eating so little the projections on my spine stood forth like corded beads. Because of eating so little my ribs jutted out as gaunt as the crazy rafters of an old roofless barn. Because of eating so little the gleam of my eyes sank far down in their sockets, looking like a gleam of water that has sunk far down in a deep well. Because of eating so little my scalp shrivelled and withered as a green bitter gourd shrivels and withers in the wind and sun. Because of eating so little my belly skin adhered to my backbone; thus if I touched my belly skin I encountered my backbone, and if I touched my backbone I encountered my belly skin.

¹⁸² MN. I. pp. 77-78.

Because of eating so little, if I tried to ease my body by rubbing my limbs with my hands, the hair, rotted at its roots, fell from my body as I rubbed.¹⁸³

For a long time the Buddha performed these kinds of ascetic practices with the five ascetics who would later become his first disciples. His subsequent decision to accept a bowl of gruel, offered by Sujātā, violated his ascetic practice, and signified that the Buddha had changed his attitude to food, leading to the middle path, a moderate form of renunciation which is distinct from the attitude to food of the other ascetics.

“I thought: ‘Why am I afraid of that pleasure that has nothing to do with sensual pleasures and unwholesome states?’ I thought: ‘I am not afraid of that pleasure since it has nothing to do with sensual pleasures and unwholesome states.’ I considered: ‘It is not easy to attain that pleasure with a body so excessively emaciated. Suppose I ate some solid food - some boiled rice and bread.’ And I ate some solid food - some boiled rice and bread...”

His ingestion of food is then a crucial basis for his subsequent liberating experiences.

“...Now when I had eaten solid food and regained my strength, then [I was] quite secluded from sensual pleasures, secluded from unwholesome states.”¹⁸⁴

In this *sutta*, the Buddha realizes that even if food is capable of causing pleasure, that pleasure is not unavoidable. The pleasure he is referring to appears to be the pleasure made accessible to a healthy mind and body through nourishment rather than the pleasure of consumption in itself, though this pleasure is also implicated in his argument. The pleasure does not function as a sensual pleasure nor does the experience invoke unwholesome states. He thinks that an appropriate intake of food could be conducive to obtaining enlightenment, whereas a severe reduction in intake can damage physical and mental functioning.

Let us look more closely at how these *sutta* texts represent the attitudes of ascetics who did practise severe austerities of food to obtain their religious ideals.

¹⁸³ Nāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 105.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*: 220.

Now at that time five bhikkhus were waiting upon me, thinking: 'If our recluse Gotama achieves some higher state, he will inform us.' But when I ate the boiled rice and bread, the five bhikkhus were disgusted and left me, thinking: 'The recluse Gotama now lives luxuriously; he has given up his striving and has reverted to luxury.'¹⁸⁵

The five ascetics, who were practising a radical reduction of intake, considered that, by his eating of a meal, the Buddha had abandoned his religious practices. In the remarks of the five ascetics, we can see that the five ascetics regarded keeping to an absolute minimum amount of food as an important factor in their religious practice and ultimately their religious ideals.

A number of Buddhist texts confirm that the five ascetics regarded this restriction of food as crucial to their religious objective. In the above *sutta*, the five ascetics describe the basic meal that the Buddha ate as 'luxury.' In the '*Travels of Fa-Xian*' (*Gaoseng faxian chuan*, 高僧法顯傳), the five ascetics are represented as being more explicit. They say that "even though the Buddha used to eat single sesame and single grain of rice a day, he could not obtain enlightenment, how then could he attain liberation now, without controlling his bodily, verbal and mental conduct in secular society."¹⁸⁶ The *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* also mentions that the five ascetics criticized the Buddha for craving food.¹⁸⁷

In summary, the Buddha, as described in the *Mahāsaccaka sutta*, is portrayed as having rejected severe food reduction from a position of strength and experience. The *sutta* narratives tell us that he had already succeeded in reducing his food intake to the minimum, mentioning a range of the types of practices found among renouncers in ancient India. It was this experience that led to his realisation that avoiding the intake of food could not be a factor in his achieving enlightenment, let alone conducive to it. Rather it damaged his body and his

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁶ T. LI. p. 864a.

¹⁸⁷ T. XXII. p. 104b.

capacity for development. The Buddha then realizes that the pleasure or sense of ease caused by food does not necessarily function as a hindrance for attaining religious ideals, so long as one does not become attached to the pleasure caused by food. We see this point reiterated in commentarial period Pali literature such as the *Visuddhimagga*, which defines the function of food as maintaining the physical body and the life faculty in the body.¹⁸⁸

Returning to the account given in the *Mahāsaccaka Sutta*, the Buddha describes how after consuming an appropriate quantity of food, his physical and mental states were as follows:

Now when I had eaten solid food and regained my strength, then quite secluded from sensual pleasures, secluded from unwholesome states, I entered upon and abided in the first *jhāna*, which is accompanied by applied and sustained thought, with rapture and pleasure born of seclusion. But such pleasant feeling that arose in me did not invade my mind and remain.¹⁸⁹

The Buddha says that he regained physical energy, without becoming attached to sensual pleasure and unwholesome states. Then, he could enter *jhāna*, which is considered a crucial component on the path to the enlightenment in Pali Buddhism.

In the *Mahāsakuludāyī Sutta*, *Majjhima Nikāya* 77, the Buddha states explicitly that he no longer follows ascetic practices in relation to food. The Buddha refutes the five qualities attributed to the Buddha by a wanderer, Udāyī. These are:

1. The Buddha consumes the minimum quantity of food and commends it.
2. The Buddha consumes any kind of alms-food and commends it.¹⁹⁰
3. The Buddha is satisfied with any kind of robe and commends it.
4. The Buddha is satisfied with any kind of resting place and commends it.
5. The Buddha is secluded and commends seclusion.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ Vism. p. 32.

¹⁸⁹ Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 220.

¹⁹⁰ Originally, this item is at the third place, but for the convenience of comparison, it is put at the second place. Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi, 1995: 424..

¹⁹¹ *Ibid*: 424-425.

Of these five, the first two relate to food issues. First of all, the Buddha explicitly refutes the first item which Udāyī praises as a quality of the Buddha:

Suppose, Udāyin, my disciples honoured, respected, revered, and venerated me, and lived in dependence on me, honouring and respecting me, with the thought: ‘The recluse Gotama eats little and commends eating little.’ Now there are disciples of mine who live on a cupful or half a cupful of food, a bilva fruit’s or half a bilva fruit’s quantity of food, while I sometimes eat the full contents of my alms-bowl or even more. So if my disciples honoured me-with the thought: ‘The recluse Gotama eats little and commends eating little,’ then those disciples of mine who live on a cupful of food ... should not honour, respect, revere, and venerate me for this quality, nor should they live in dependence on me, honouring and respecting me.¹⁹²

In this *sutta*, the Buddha contends that reverence for him should not be dependent on how little he eats, since some of his disciples eat less. Since he sometimes ingests the “full contents of his alms-bowl or even more,” minimising food intake should not be regarded as a mark of status for a renouncer. The Buddha goes a stage further and explains to Udāyin that he does not rely only on going for alms but may even accept an ‘invitation meal.’ Furthermore, at such invitation meals, monks might be offered and permitted to accept sumptuous food:

“Suppose, Udāyin, my disciples honoured, respected, revered, and venerated me, and lived in dependence on me, honouring and respecting me, with the thought: ‘The recluse Gotama is content with any kind of alms-food and commends contentment with any kind of almsfood.’ Now there are disciples of mine who are alms-food eaters, who go on unbroken alms-round from house to house, who delight in gathering their food; when they have entered among the houses they will not consent even when invited to sit down. But I sometimes eat on invitation meals of choice rice and many sauces and curries. So if my disciples honoured me ... with the thought: ‘The recluse Gotama is content with any kind of alms-food and commends contentment with any kind of alms-food,’ then those disciples of mine who are alms-food eaters ... should not honour, respect, revere, and venerate me for this quality, nor

¹⁹² *Ibid*: 424.

should they live in dependence on me, honouring and respecting me.¹⁹³

2-3. Permitted ascetic practices, *dhutaṅga*

While indicating that, due to his detachment from it, the Buddha does not fear the taste of food, the text just cited also makes reference to disciples of his who do undertake restrictive food practices, such as a restricted diet – in the above case a mono-diet using one kind of fruit – or the practice of going from ‘house to house’ to receive food. These ascetic practices, the *dhutaṅga*, are permitted within Buddhism yet it is clear that – unlike the Hindu traditions cited by Olivelle (above) – the Buddha does not equate the ability to restrict food intake with spiritual progress. This being so, why are there ascetic practices in Buddhism at all?

Theraḡāthā verse 923 describes the attitude to food of a monk who does not have greed and knows contentment in eating food as follows:

[I] consume food without craving for and attachment to, whether it is tasty or coarse, whether a little or a plenty. I ate it to survive.¹⁹⁴

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that significant roles in obtaining purity of various kinds are played by the virtues of ‘no greed’ and ‘knowing contentment’, and that these virtues can be developed through the undertaking of the permitted ascetic practices (*dhutaṅga*).¹⁹⁵

Dhūta/dhuta is derived from the root, ‘*dhū*,’ and literally means ‘to be shaken, moved and shaken off.’¹⁹⁶ In Buddhist texts, *dhūta/dhuta* means ‘shaken off defilements’ or ‘purified’. The post-Buddhaghosa Pali commentator Dhammapāla interprets *dhūta* as having two referents as follows:

A. A person who has removed defilements.

¹⁹³ Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 425.

¹⁹⁴ Thag. 923.

¹⁹⁵ Vism. p. 59.

¹⁹⁶ PED. 342.

B. The practical virtues to eliminate defilement.¹⁹⁷

The word *aṅga* means a component or factor. The Sanskrit equivalent of the word *dhutaṅga* is *dhūtaguṇa*, so we can see that the term either means ‘aspects/qualities of a purified person’ or, perhaps, ‘factors [for, i.e. that make] a purified person,’ and it refers in Buddhism to the permitted ascetic practices. In Pali texts, the *dhutaṅga* means ‘the practical virtues to eliminate defilement.’¹⁹⁸

The *Visuddhimagga* lists 13 ascetic practices (*terasa dhutaṅgāni*),¹⁹⁹ and states that these ascetic practices are those which are suitable for the monks who have greedy (*lobha*) or foolish dispositions (*moha*).²⁰⁰ The *dhutaṅga* are Buddhist practices aimed at developing control over one’s impulses and removing the desires that relate to the basic necessities of life – food, clothing and shelter – and which cause defilements (*kilesa*).²⁰¹

The list of 13 *dhutaṅga* described in the *Visuddhimagga* is a systematisation of those permitted ascetic practices found in the canon. We find that in other traditions, such as the *Ekottara Āgama* (增一阿含經), a different list, of 12, developed, and was in turn taken up in Mahāyāna literature. I shall first list the 13 ascetic practices of the *Visuddhimagga*, then I shall show through a comparative table where we find different practices in the Pali canon. I shall then outline the occurrence of 12 *dhūtaguṇa* in the *Ekottara Āgama* and Mahāyāna sūtra literature. The *Visuddhimagga* list is as follows:

1. the refuse-rag-wearer’s practice (*paṃsukūlikaṅga*)
2. the triple-robe-wearer’s practice, (*tecīvarikaṅga*)
3. the alms-food-eater’s practice, (*piṇḍapātikaṅga*)
4. the house-to-house-seeker’s practice, , (*sapadānacārikaṅga*)
5. the one-sessioner’s practice, (*ekāsanikaṅga*)

¹⁹⁷ Abe 2001: 5-6.

¹⁹⁸ Abe 2001: 6.

¹⁹⁹ Vism. p. 81.

²⁰⁰ Ibid. p. 104. *Kassa dhūtāṅga sevanā sappāyā ti rāgacaritassa c’eva mohacaritassa ca.*

²⁰¹ Abe 2001: 91.

6. the bowl-food-eater's practice, (*pattapiṇḍikaṅga*)
7. the later-food-refuser's practice, (*khalupacchābhattikaṅga*)
8. the forest-dweller's practice, (*ārañṇikaṅga*)
9. the tree-root-dweller's practice, (*rukhamūlikaṅga*)
10. the open-air-dweller's practice, (*abbhokāsikaṅga*)
11. the charnel-ground-dweller's practice, (*sosānikaṅga*)
12. the any-bed-user's practice, (*yathāsanthatikaṅga*)
13. the sitter's practice. (*nesajikaṅga*).²⁰²

These 13 Buddhist ascetic practices are classified into 3 groups and explained as follows:

A. the first group relate to clothes

1. the refuse-rag-wearer's practice: the monk wears worthless cloth and the clothes which have been discarded s. He rejects clothes which have been donated by lay followers.
2. the triple-robe-wearer's practice: the monk wears only three robes: outer robe (*saṅghāṭī*), upper robe (*uttara- āsaṅga*), and inner robe (*antara-vāsaka*).

B. the second group relates to food or eating

3. the alms-food-eater's practice: the monk refuses 14 kinds of meals such as the *saṅghā* meal, invitation meal, etc and consumes only alms-food. (see. the explanation of the 14 kinds of meals in the next paragraph).
4. the house-to-house-seeker's practice: the monk takes the alms-round house by house and village by village without skipping any houses or villages. He is permitted to avoid certain village or roads if they are dangerous for alm-rounds.
5. the one-sessioner's practice: the monk takes only one meal each day. Once he rises up from his seat during or after his first meal he will not sit to eat again that day.
6. the bowl-food-eater's practice: the monk consumes the first bowl of food of the day and he no longer eats a second.
7. the later-food-refuser's practice: the monk only satiates his hunger once each day

C. the third group related to lodgings

8. the forest-dweller's practice: the monk resides not in the monastery, but in the forest.

²⁰² Translation Ñāṇamoli 1975: 55.

9. the tree-root-dweller's practice: the monk refuses living indoors and resides under a tree.
10. the open-air-dweller's practice: the monk not only rejects living indoors but dwells without the shelter of a tree.
11. the charnel-ground-dweller's practice: the monk lives in a cemetery or alongside a grave.
12. the any-bed-user's practice: the monk does without lodgings of his own and accepts any which is available to him.
13. the sitter's practice: the monk never lies down, and only sits.

Having explained the 13 ascetic practices briefly, we shall now explore in more detail the five ascetic practices which relate to food or eating.

Even though early Pali texts mention the *dhutaṅga* practices, they had not established full-fledged forms of them and do not explain each ascetic practice fully. Hence, we are dependent on the *Visuddhimagga* for understanding the Buddhist ascetic practices fully. There are further materials to help understand the *dhutaṅga* practices such as the *Vimuttimaggā* and some Chinese texts. Whenever these texts are suitable to use, they shall be also mentioned here. The five food-related ascetic practices can be explained as follows:

1. the alms-food-eater's practice

Establishment : when a monk states that he refuses a supplementary [food] supply or says I undertake the almsfood eater's practice, this practice starts to work.²⁰³

Regulation: a monk who practises this practice refuses 14 kinds of food. The 14 varieties of food are as follows:

- a. a meal offered to the Order (*saṅgha-bhatta*)
- b. a meal offered to specified *bhikkhus* (*uddesa-bhatta*)
- c. a meal of an invitation (*nimantana-bhatta*)

²⁰³ Vism. p. 66.

- d. a meal given by a ticket (*salāka-bhatta*), i.e. allocated according to tickets distributed to monks during a time of hardship to ensure each gets a share.
- e. one each half-moon day (*pakkhika-bhatta*)
- f. one each Uposatha day (*uposathika-bhatta*)
- g. one each first of the half-moon (*pāṭipadika-bhatta*)
- h. a meal given for visitors (*āgantuka-bhatta*)
- i. a meal for travellers (*gamika-bhatta*)
- j. a meal for the sick (*gilāna-bhatta*)
- k. a meal for sick-nurses (*gilā-nupaṭṭhāka-bhatta*)
- l. a meal supplied to a [particular] residence (*vihāra-bhatta*), i.e. food brought to a particular monastery to be shared at that monastery.
- m. a meal given in a principal house (*dhura-bhatta*)
- n. a meal given in turn (*vāra-bhatta*).²⁰⁴

Infraction: this practice is breached when the practitioner accepts extra food, for example a meal given to the Order, etc.²⁰⁵

Benefit: this practice brings the following benefits:

- a. it makes the practitioner be content with the lumps of alms-food.
- b. it removes the craving for the taste of food.
- c. it makes the practitioner's life conform to frugality.²⁰⁶

The *Vimuttimaggā* also explains this practice in terms similar to the *Visuddhimaggā*, but the difference between the two texts is that the *Vimuttimaggā* mentions only three kinds of invitation meals (general invitation, invitation to visit, and repeated invitation) and this practice is violated when the practitioner accepts

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁵ *Ibid:* p. 67.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

these three invitation meals.²⁰⁷ This text states that the benefit of this practice could be to remove the craving for the taste of food. This opinion is also expressed by the *Yuqie shidi lun* (the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*, 瑜伽師地論). This mentions that there are cravings both for taste and for quantity of food. These two cravings hinder the cultivation of wholesomeness of mind, therefore, to remove these two cravings and to control the craving for taste of food one should practise the alms-food-eater's practice.²⁰⁸

2. the house-to-house-seeker's practice, (*sapadānacārikaṅga*)

Establishment: when a monk states that he refuses greedy alms round or says "I undertake the house-to-house seeker's practice", this practice starts to work.²⁰⁹

Regulation: a monk following this practice should make sure that there is no danger at the village or roads or houses he visits. For this reason, he should enter the village early so that he would be able to bypass these dangerous places and go elsewhere. But when it is the time for alms food, the monk should take his alms-round in any village at which he has arrived and should not pass it by. If he cannot obtain any food there, he may leave the village.²¹⁰

Infraction: this practice is breached when the practitioner starts to take alms-food from the houses where good food is given.²¹¹

Benefit: this practice brings the benefits as follows:

- a. it makes monks avoid family support.
- b. it does not make the practitioner anticipate that close lay followers will bring food to him.

²⁰⁷ T. XXXII. p. 405a.

²⁰⁸ T. XXX. p. 422c.

²⁰⁹ Vism. p. 67.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 67-68.

²¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 68.

- c. it leads to a greedless life.²¹²

The *Vimuttimagga* states that if a monk obtains agreeable and abundant food from a particular house during this practice, he should not re-visit the house, and if he doubts whether or not he has visited a house before, he should avoid the house as one for alms-food.²¹³

Neither the *Visuddhimagga* nor the *Vimuttimagga* mention what benefit this practice brings in terms of controlling the craving caused by food, but the *Yuqie shidi lun* (瑜伽師地論, the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*) remarks that this practice removes the craving for the taste of food.²¹⁴

3. the one-sessioner's practice, (*ekāsanikaṅga*)

Establishment: when a monk states that he refuses to eat over multiple sessions or says “I accept the one-sessioner's practice”, this practice starts to work.²¹⁵

Regulation: a monk who follows this practice should choose a proper seat and sit on it. If his teacher enters while he is eating, he may choose whether to observe the duty of a disciple, standing up from the seat, or whether to finish eating, without rising up from his seat.²¹⁶

Infraction: this practice is breached when the practitioner consumes food in more than one session in a day.²¹⁷

Benefit: this practice brings the following benefits:

- a. it makes the practitioner lose the craving for the taste of food.

²¹² *Ibid.*

²¹³ T. XXXII. p. 405a.

²¹⁴ T. XXX. p. 422c.

²¹⁵ Vism. p. 69.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*

- b. it makes the practitioner lead a greedless life.²¹⁸

The *Vimuttimagga* states that there are three limitations: the sitting limitation, the water limitation, and the food limitation. The sitting limitation means that a monk cannot sit again after eating; the water limitation means a monk cannot eat again after he has brought water and has washed his bowl; the food limitation means a monk cannot consume food after the moment when he thinks that he has eaten his last morsel of the day. However, taking medicine and drinking water are permitted.²¹⁹ The *Yuqie shidi lun* (瑜伽師地論, the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*) declares that this practice removes the craving for quantity of food, unlike the view of the *Visuddhimagga*.²²⁰

4. the bowl-food-eater's practice, (*pattapiṇḍikaṅga*)

Establishment: when a monk states that he refuses a second bowl of food or that he accepts the bowl-food-eater's practice, this practice starts to work.²²¹

Regulation: a monk who follows this practice may avoid repulsive combinations of different kinds of food such as a mixture of fish and gruel in the same bowl. However, he should accept food in a bowl which is not disgusting such as honey, sugar, etc. He should be sure to receive the right amount, because a second bowl is prohibited: not even a leaf of a tree is allowed.²²²

Infraction: this practice is breached when the practitioner accept a second bowl of food.²²³

Benefit: this practice brings the benefits as follows:

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*

²¹⁹ T. XXXII. p. 405b.

²²⁰ T. XXX. p. 422c.

²²¹ Vism. p. 70.

²²² *Ibid.*

²²³ *Ibid.*

- a. it makes the practitioner lose the craving for variety of flavour.
- b. it makes the practitioner abandon excessive wishes.
- c. it makes the practitioner see the purpose of food and learn to judge the right amount of it.
- d. it makes the practitioner lead a greed-free life.²²⁴

The *Vimuttimaggā* gives a different title for this practice, the ‘Measured Food Practice’.²²⁵ Whilst performing this practice, the monk should make a reckoning of the amount of food he has, whether it is excessive or insufficient. He should not accept unnecessary food and avoid indulgence while measuring the quantity of food. This text states that this practice has the benefits that it controls the amount of food, ensures a comfortable stomach, and removes craving.²²⁶

5. the later-food-refuser’s practice, (*khalupacchābhattikaṅga*)

Establishment: when a monk states that he refuses additional food or he accepts the later-food-refuser’s practice, this practice starts to work.²²⁷

Regulation: when the practitioner expresses that he is satiated, he should not later have food made allowable to him to consume.²²⁸

Infraction: this practice is breached when the practitioner eats what has been made allowable again after he has shown that he has consumed enough.²²⁹

Benefit: this practice brings the following benefits:

²²⁴ *Ibid.*

²²⁵ The *Dazhidu lun* (大智度論, the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā śāstra*, T. XXV. p. 537a.) and the *Xiaopin banruo boluomi jing* (小品般若波羅蜜經, the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, T. VIII. p.570b) also call this practice (*pattapiṇḍikaṅga*) the ‘Practice economizing the quantity of food (節量食).’

²²⁶ T. XXXII. p. 405 b.

²²⁷ *Vism.* p. 71.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*

²²⁹ *Ibid.*

- a. it distances the practitioner from committing the offence of taking additional food.
- b. it does not make the practitioner overeat.
- c. it does not make the practitioner keep or search for food again.
- d. it makes the practitioner lead a greed-free life.²³⁰

The *Vimuttimagga* mentions that once the practitioner has consumed 21 morsels of food, he should not accept any more.²³¹ The *Fanwan jing guji ji* (梵網經古適記), a commentary on the *Brahmajāla Sūtra*, states that the practice makes the practitioner lose the craving for quantity of food.²³²

In the Pali canon, the 13 ascetic practices are found scattered in different texts. They are all brought together for the first time in the *Parivāra* in the Pāli *vinaya*. The *Parivāra* is the last part of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, which summarises and analyses various rules in the previous volumes of the *vinaya*. The *Sutta Nipāta* and *Udāna* have relatively short lists of four ascetic practices, called *ārañṇika*, *piṇḍapātika*, *paṃsukūlika* and *tecīvarikaṇḍa*. Other texts from the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, which are generally regarded as later, including the *Mahāniddesa* (regarded as an early commentary on a section of the *Sutta Nipāta*) have longer lists.

The shortest lists include relatively basic restraints: staying in the forest (*ārañṇika*), living entirely from begging (*piṇḍapātika*), wearing only discarded robes (*paṃsukūlika*), and ownership of just three robes (*tecīvarika*). The fuller lists include more extreme practices such as the practice of always sitting up and never lying (*nesajjika*), one of the most severe forms of ascetic practice.²³³ Although the *Parivāra* includes the list of 13, it is not organised in any particular order, whereas in the

²³⁰ *Ibid.*

²³¹ T. XXXII. p. 405b.

²³² T. XL. p. 715a.

²³³ Abe 2001: 114-115; Turner, Cox and Bocking 2013: 1-16.

Visuddhimagga they are organised into type of practice according to the requisites to which they refer.

The lists of 12 ascetic practices in *Mahāyāna* literature are not consistent with the *Visuddhimagga*'s list of 13. The *Xiaopin banruo jing* (小品般若經, *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*) has 12 *dhūtāṅga* practices, and excludes the practice of sequential begging for alms food (*sapadānacārikaṅga*).²³⁴ Other *Mahāyāna* texts such as the *Dapin banruo jing* (摩訶般若波羅蜜經, *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*)²³⁵ and the *Dazhidulun* (大智度論, *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra*)²³⁶ also have 12 ascetic practices, this time excluding the practice of accepting any bedding and shelter (*yathāsanthatikaṅga*).

What is striking is the fact that the Buddha, whilst describing the practices of his disciples in the the *Mahāsakuludāyī Sutta* includes practices not among the permitted *dhutaṅga*, such as the practice of living only on *bilva* fruit or that of eating only gathered or scavenged food. This is confirmed in other Buddhist texts, such as those *jātaka* stories which contain references to Buddhist monks who sought to live only on fruits and leaves.²³⁷

²³⁴ T. VIII. p. 570b.

²³⁵ T. VIII. p. 320c.

²³⁶ T. XXV. p. 537a.

²³⁷ In the Pali *Jātaka*, there are many stories in which the Buddha-to-be or ascetics live on wild fruits, roots and barks in the *Himalayas* and descend to Benares or other places (border villages or *Rājagaha*) to procure salt, vinegar and seasoning. In these *Jātakas*, the way of life of ascetic practices is described as common in the Buddha-to-be and other ascetics. However, Andrew Skilton, who explores the story of *Kṣāntivādin*, which is equivalent to the Pali *Khantivādi Jātaka*, mainly in *Mahāyāna* texts, introduces in his article an unusual *kṣāntivādin* story in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya*. In this story, the ascetic, *Kṣāntivādin*, requests permission to descend to Benares from his master (*upadhyāya*) to procure food supplies when his foodstuffs run out. The story says, “He exclaims: ‘I cannot live on forest herbs! (*na śaknomi āraṇyakābhir oṣadhībhir yāpayitum*)’”(Gnoli 1978: 7, translated Skilton 2002: 127). Skilton also suggests that the fact that *Kṣāntivādin* has a master (*upadhyāya*) is surprising in that the title signifies a monastic instructor in a Buddhist context (Skilton 2002: 127). This attitude to food in the *Kṣāntivādin* story in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* is significantly different from that of the Pali *Jātaka*. However, this *Mūlasarvāstivāda kṣāntivādin* story not only witnesses that there is non-ascetic way of food practice, but

We can thus see that while the tradition such as the *Parivāra* and *Visuddhimagga* sought to systematise permitted practices, from the *sutta* and *jātaka* evidence it looks as if the Buddha's followers may have pursued a range of practices relating to restricted food intake that are more recognisable from the kind of practice mentioned by Olivelle in relation to Hindu ascetics. These include: eating only that which is found in the forest; living on unhusked (wild-growing grain); eating bulbs and roots; eating fruit, and eating pot-herbs.²³⁸

2-4. *Vikālabhojana*: not eating after noon in *sutta* texts

also that implicitly there is ascetic practice on food at the same time. The Pali *Jātaka* remarks the ascetic practice on food in which the Buddha-to-be and ascetics do:

<i>Jātaka</i>	Place for ascetic practice	Food on which they live	why they re-enter society	where they re-enter society
173. Makkata	Himālaya	Fruits and barks	X	
180. Duddada	Himālaya	X	Salt and seasoning	A village
235. Vacchanakha	Himālaya	X	Salt and seasoning	Benares
246. Telovāda	Himālaya	X	Salt and seasoning	Benares
313. Khantivādi	Himālaya	Fruits	Salt and vinegar	Benares
372. Migapotaka	Himālaya	Fruits	X	X
376. Avāriya	Himālaya	Fruits	Salt and vinegar	Benares
380. Āsaṅka	Himālaya	Fruits and roots	X	X
403. Aṭṭhisena	Himālaya	X	Salt and vinegar	Benares
406. Gandhāra	Himālaya	Fruits	Salt and vinegar	Border village
418. Aṭṭhasadda	Himālaya	X	Salt and vinegar	Benares
426. Dīpi	Himālaya	X	Salt and vinegar	Rājagaha

Table 2.2. Ascetic practice concerning food seen in the *Jātaka*

There is a typical pattern of the ascetic practice on food in the *Jātaka* stories. The Buddha-to-be or ascetics live on fruits, roots and barks in the Himalayas and sometimes they descend to secular places like Benares or other places to procure the essential foodstuffs such as salt or vinegar for the sustaining their life. According to the table above, ascetics in the *Jātaka* seem to live on wild foodstuffs such as fruits, roots and barks and to come down secular city or village to get essential foodstuffs for their lives and health like salt and vinegar. However, the *kṣāntivādin* story in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* does not seem to share this practice on food, but it suggests that its viewpoint towards food is explicitly distinct from that of the *Jātaka* — “I cannot live on forest herbs!”

²³⁸ Olivelle 1991: 25.

Although in the *Mahāsakuludāyi Sutta* the Buddha speaks of how he does not concern himself with the amount he eats or other restrictive practice, the regulation of not eating after noon became one of the ten precepts of novices, monks and nuns, and this continues to be practised in Theravada countries to this day.²³⁹ In the *vinaya* the practice of not eating after noon is attributed to the Buddha in rule *Pācittiya* 37, which we will examine in chapter 3, but it is told more fully in a number of *sutta* texts, in particular the *Laṭukikopamā Sutta*, *Majjhima Nikāya* 66. The origination story for this rule in the *vinaya* is quite different from the story given in the *Laṭukikopamā Sutta* which we shall discuss here.

In this *sutta* the Buddha's interlocutor is the monk Udāyin, who also appeared in the *Mahāsakuludāyi Sutta* (above), in which the Buddha rejected the association of food restriction with spiritual status. In this *sutta*, Udāyin remarks that originally monks used to consume meals three times a day, but the Buddha instructed the monks to abandon first the afternoon meal and then the one in the evening.²⁴⁰ Udāyin explains that this was difficult at first because lay people would give them delicious, non-staple foods during the day, and also because cooking sumptuous food is done in the evening. He states that what they discovered, upon giving up these meals at the Buddha's behest, was that abandoning these two meals saves monks from all types of dangers. Udāyin lists the types of problems that used to befall monks when they took alms at night:

“It has happened, venerable sir, that *bhikkhus* wandering for alms in the thick darkness of the night have walked into a cesspit, fallen into a sewer, walked into a thornbush, and fallen over

²³⁹ Food issues in East Asian Buddhism are related to the labour of monks in the monasteries, and it is the motto of East Asian Buddhism that, ‘the monk who does not work, should not eat.’ The more influential monastic code which regulates the life of monks in East Asian Buddhism is not a *vinaya* which has been established in India but the Monastic Regulations, the *Qinggui* (清規), which has been established in China and does not consider eating after noon as the violation of precept. In the *Qinggui*, physical labour in a monastic field is considered as religious practice and insofar as monks work for their food, three meals a day is considered a normal eating habit.

²⁴⁰ MN. I. p. 448.

a sleeping cow; they have met hoodlums who had already committed a crime and those planning one, and they have been sexually enticed by women. Once, venerable sir, I went wandering for alms in the thick darkness of the night. A woman washing a pot saw me by a flash of lightning and screamed out in terror: 'Mercy me, a devil has come for me!' I told her: 'Sister, I am no devil, I am a *bhikkhu* waiting for alms.' -'Then it's a *bhikkhu* whose ma's died and whose pa's died!²⁴¹ Better, *bhikkhu*, that you get your belly cut open with a sharp butcher's knife than this prowling for alms for your belly's sake in the thick darkness of the night!' Venerable sir, when I recollected that I thought: 'How many painful states has the Blessed One rid us of! How many pleasant states has the Blessed One brought us! How many unwholesome states has the Blessed One rid us of! How many wholesome states has the Blessed One brought us!'"²⁴²

Even though this *sutta* gives the physical dangers of wandering around at night for alms as the justification for only eating one meal a day, it seems from the final section of the *sutta* that the aim relates to ensuring detachment from secular society, removing the five cords of sensual pleasure, and practising form and formless concentrations, which are noble pleasures:

There are, Udayin, five cords of sensual pleasure. What are the five? Forms cognizable by the eye that are wished for, desired, agreeable, and likeable, connected with sensual desire and provocative of lust. Sounds cognizable by the ear ... Odours cognizable by the nose ... Flavours cognizable by the tongue ... Tangibles cognizable by the body that are wished for, desired, agreeable, and likeable, connected with sensual desire and provocative of lust. These are the five cords of sensual pleasure.

Now, Udayin, the pleasure and joy that arise dependent on these five cords of sensual pleasure are called sensual pleasure – a filthy pleasure, a coarse pleasure, an ignoble pleasure. I say of this kind of pleasure that it should not be pursued, that it should not be developed, that it should not be cultivated, that it should be feared.²⁴³

Here then, although the Buddha gives importance to eating so that one has the strength to meditate and develop higher forms of concentration, in this *sutta* he

²⁴² *Ibid.* pp. 448-449.

²⁴³ MN. I. p. 454

nonetheless emphasises that food is to be feared, since it can be the basis for invoking responses that can in turn cause attachment. The *sutta* is called “the simile of a quail”, because what might be regarded as a small unimportant creeper can, for a small bird like a quail, prove to be an overwhelming fetter in which it can be snared and from which it will fail to escape. Similarly, though it might be argued that the rules of eating are just a small matter, not one of serious consequence, for some it could prove in reality to be a major obstacle preventing their development. Therefore we see a curtailment of food intake in Buddhism, not as an attempt to seriously diminish the intake of food, but to avoid the temptations of preferred flavours and the social contexts surrounding food, and also to keep monks away from the dangers encountered wandering around at night.

An alternative or further reason for the establishment of this rule is given in another *sutta*. In the *Kīṭāgiri Sutta, Majjhima nikāya* 70, the Buddha introduces his rejection of eating at night on the basis of the health advantages of doing so:

Bhikkhus, I abstain from night meal. By doing so, I do not have illness and pain, and I enjoy health, strength and a comfortable abiding. *Bhikkhus*, come and abstain from night meal. By doing so, you will not have illness and pain, and you will enjoy health, strength and a comfortable abiding.²⁴⁴

In this *sutta*, the Buddha says that night food causes illness and pain. In the *Kakacūpama Sutta, Majjhima nikāya* 21, the Buddha gives the same reason for only eating one meal a day, i.e. not eating after noon:

Bhikkhus, I eat at a single session. By so doing, I am free from illness and affliction, and I enjoy health, strength, and a comfortable abiding. Come, *bhikkhus*, eat at a single session. By so doing, you will be free from illness and affliction, and you will enjoy health, strength, and a comfortable abiding.²⁴⁵

²⁴⁴ MN. I. p. 473.

²⁴⁵ Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi. 1995: 134-135.

Whereas in the *Laṭukikopamā sutta*, the reasoning behind only eating before noon was to avoid physical dangers and sensual temptations, in these two *suttas*, then, health is the primary reason given. In the first of these, the *Kīṭāgiri sutta*, as well as in the *Bhaddāli sutta*, *Majjhima nikāya* 65, monks object to the imposition of this rule. In the *Kīṭāgiri sutta* a group of monks ask, since they are perfectly healthy eating morning, afternoon and night, why they should give up meals after noon simply because that is what suits the Buddha himself. The Buddha scolds the monks for quibbling, pointing out that he is the one who knows best what will prove to be to their advantage. In the *Bhaddāli sutta*, the monk Bhaddāli refuses to take up the practice because he feels it would cause him too much anxiety. The Buddha offers him a compromise – that he keeps some of his food back to eat later, so that he can get used to the new eating practice while still only receiving one meal a day. Initially Bhaddāli refuses but later apologises to the Buddha for his conduct.²⁴⁶

A further reason for not consuming after noon is found in a Mahāyāna *sūtra* on the *dhūtaguṇa* translated by Guṇabhadra (求那跋陀羅). The *Fo shuo shier toutuo jing* (*The 12 dhūtaguṇa Sūtra preached by the Buddha*, 佛說十二頭陀經) says as follows:

[Monks] should have the attitude like this, “even in seeking just one meal a day, I am perpetually disturbed in many ways. Then, how can I [seek for] morning, midday and night meals? Even though it is in itself not harmful, we might waste half a day.”²⁴⁷

Unlike the previous reasons identified above, this text asserts that eating food after noon is unproblematic and instead identifies the time it takes up as the problem. Due to the time required to do so frequent seeking out of alms food disturbs essential religious practice.

To sum up, it can be said that the practice of eating ‘a meal a day’ has been established by the Buddha in spite of opposition from some monks who had cravings

²⁴⁶ MN. I. p. 124. On this exception in relation to a new rule, see Huxley 1996: 149.

²⁴⁷ T. XVII. p. 721a.

for flavour and for food in quantity. Even though the Buddha and some other monks insisted that a meal a day was good for health, other reasons given in support of this rule are that it avoids the dangers of roaming at night, it helps monks avoid attachment and even, that it means the business of eating is over early in the day, thus securing the time for religious practices. Thus although food is in itself not psychologically problematic for an enlightened person such as the Buddha, it could cause problems for others, be detrimental for physical health and make monks' lifestyles too close to that of lay people's. It seems likely that these decisions were also influenced by the contemporary dietary customs among renouncers, as we shall see further in Chapter Three, on *vinaya* regulations.

2-5. Food as a Preliminary to Meditation

Through the remarks attributed to the Buddha above, it is conveyed that he does not fear the taste and quantity of food. As stated in the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta*, the Buddha's emphasis is on mental detachment from the pleasure caused by food, rather than avoidance of the pleasure or substance itself. As a result of his detachment, he is able to undertake the meditative practices that lead up to his achievement of enlightenment.

The Buddha's attitude to the taste and quantity of food and its connection to meditative practices continue to be featured and expanded in Chinese *Mahāyāna* texts. The famous Chinese *Tiantai* school takes up these two factors – the attitude to food and its association with meditation. In addition to these, the medical value of food becomes more conspicuous. A text from the *Tiantai* school, the *Shichan boluomi cidī famen* (釋禪波羅蜜次第法門), explains that to practise meditation properly we should control the quantity of food:

When we overeat or are satiated with food, the flow of bodily energy is blocked and body is felt stuffed. When almost all of bodily energies are blocked, mind is closed and blocked and

when we meditate, mind is apprehensive.

When we less eat, the body becomes emaciated, mind is unstable and our willpower becomes firm. All of these are what we could not obtain the path for meditations...

It is said in a *sūtra* that when we know the correct quantity of food, we are pleasant all the time, stay calm place, and tranquil mind enjoys religious endeavour. This is called the teaching of *Buddhas*.²⁴⁸

This *Tiantai* meditative text emphasizes that practitioners should avoid both extremes in relation to eating, and eat neither the minimum nor the maximum. In this text, the emphasis on the balanced attitude to food is connected to meditative practice as in the *Sekha sutta*, *Majjhima Nikāya*, 53 in which ‘moderation in eating’ is related to obtaining the 4 *jhāna*. In addition to these, the *Tiantai* meditation text, the *Mohezhi guan* (摩訶止觀), connects food to medical treatment, which became a significant factor in *Tiantai* meditative practice. This text mentions two aspects of food. The first part is the relationship between particular food items and the ‘four elements (*catāro mahābhūtā*, 四大)’:

When we do not control the consumption of food, it causes illness. Ginger and cinnamon, which are spicy, increase the ‘fire element (*tejo dhātu*)’; sugarcane and honey, which are sweet and cold, increase the ‘water element (*āpo dhātu*).’ Pear increases the ‘wind element (*vāyo dhātu*)’, and oil and fat increase the ‘earth element (*paṭhavi dhātu*).’ (For example), it is like that when we catch a fever, cucumber is conducive to recovering ...

When the fire element is located at the lower body, food is digested and invigorates internal organs – as the proverb says, “if you wish for long life, you should warm your feet and cool your head. When the fire element is located at the upper body and you ingest the food which makes you feel apprehensive, this will result in bodily and mental illnesses.”²⁴⁹

This text provides religious practitioners with medical advice which serves to support proper meditation practice by helping them avoid physical and mental ailments. The tastes of particular foods are analysed for meditative practices through which

²⁴⁸ T. XLVI, p. 489b.

²⁴⁹ T. XLVI, p. 107a.

practitioners seek liberation and become a Buddha.

The second medical aspect of food mentioned in this text is the relationship between the taste of food in general and diseases in the five organs: the heart, liver, spleen, lungs and kidneys:

The five tastes of food can be beneficial to or damage to the five internal organs. Sourness is beneficial to the liver but damages the spleen. Bitterness is beneficial to the heart but damages the lungs. Spicy taste is beneficial to the lungs but damages the liver. Saltiness is beneficial to the kidneys but damages the heart. Sweetness is beneficial to the spleen but damages the kidneys. When we know that one of the five organs has been damaged by one of the five tastes of food, one should avoid that harmful taste and ingest food of the beneficial taste.²⁵⁰

This Tiantai text elaborates the characteristics and function of the taste of a particular food item and taste in general for the purpose of meditation. The text shows that the attitude to taste and quantity of food has been developed into a kind of medical system, which serves the need of religious practitioners in pursuit of religious ideals.

The Buddha's rejection of existing renouncer attitudes to food, as portrayed in the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta* and *Mahāsakuludāyi Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, makes the Buddhist attitude to food distinct among other religious groups: it accepts the necessity of food, and of its possible beneficial effect, namely the physical strength with which monks could attain their religious goals. The importance of attitude towards food and moderation in eating found in early Buddhism and then extended in later forms of Buddhism can also be seen when we examine examples of Chinese texts of the *Tiantai* school. The *Shichan boluomi cidi famen* emphasizes that meditation practitioners should avoid the extremes of minimum and maximum food consumption. In the meditation text, the *Mohezhiqian*, this attitude towards food is developed into a systematic manual in which medical knowledge further authorises

²⁵⁰ T. XLVI, p. 107a.

the inherited Buddhist attitude towards food.

2-6. The Perils of Food: Taste and quantity

In the previous section we saw how the Buddha is portrayed as rejecting, and justifying his rejection of, the ascetic renouncer's emphasis on minimising the intake and types of food. The Buddha even authorises eating a meal by invitation rather through alms round, and luxurious food items. This is because food is important for optimum physical and mental functioning, and because it is the craving for food rather than food per se that is the problem. Detachment from food is the ideal. Yet it is recognised in early and later Buddhism that this ideal may be hard to attain in practice. There were also other considerations such as the adverse effect of wandering for food late in the day.

This section looks at further evidence concerning the psychological problems connected with food by investigating how canonical and commentarial texts discuss such perils and provide stories to act as countermeasures that warn monks of them.

The 5th century CE Pali compendium, the *Visuddhimagga*, in introducing a meditation on the repulsiveness of food states:

There is attachment when there is food, and it causes serious peril.²⁵¹

Mahāyāna texts also point out this characteristic, that food can cause attachment. The *Yuqie shidi lun* (the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*, 瑜伽師地論) mentions that food has taste which causes craving.²⁵² In relation to this attachment, the *Mahīśāsaka Vinaya* explicitly expresses that “the attachment of the taste of food is defilement (垢)”:

We become attached to the pleasant taste and chase after (pleasant) sound and colour.

I consider these as defilements (*kilesa*). Therefore, I abandon worshipping a fire²⁵³

²⁵¹ Vism, p. 341.

²⁵² T. III, p. 501b.

²⁵³ T. XXII, p. 110a: With anger (*dosa*) and ignorance (*moha*), greed (*lobha*) is mentioned as fire in the *Dīgha Nikāya* (DN. III, p. 217).

The attachment in question is experienced as craving for food and the positive experience, the pleasure of the taste of a food, is the prerequisite to craving. In order to examine the relationship between the experience of taste and the development of craving and attachment more closely, I shall return to the subject in Chapter 6. There, in the context of looking at Buddhist meditation practices directed towards attachment to food, I shall turn to the work of modern psychology on this subject. For now, I shall turn again to narrative teachings which act as parables for monastic practice and see how these warn Buddhist monks of the perils of attachment to food.

Although the *Jātaka* stories about the Buddha-to-be's former lifetimes are generally accepted as a form of popular literature, a survey of the 'stories of the present' which frame the tales indicates that many of them were included in the Buddhist corpus to give guidance to monks on how to behave.²⁵⁴ Several of them offer guidance about the peril of attachment to the taste of food. The 14th *jātaka* in the Pali 'canonical' collection, the *Vāṭamiga Jātaka*, gives the most explicit warning of the peril of indulging in the taste of food. Here is a summary of the story:

There was a wealthy young nobleman at Rājagaha. One day, he heard the Dhamma teaching at Bamboo Grove from the Buddha and wished to become a Buddhist monk. Initially he could not gain the consent to be a monk from his parents, but finally obtained their permission by refusing food for 7 days. He then became a practitioner of the *dhutaṅga* practices related to eating. He became an intelligent and promising monk in the Buddhist Sangha.

At a festival at Rājagaha the monk's mother was bewailing her son's absence and his departure to Sāvattī with the Buddha. A slave-girl saw the mother weeping and asked the reason. Hearing from the mother how her heart was torn by sorrow and how she longed for her son's return, the slave-girl asked the mother what the son's favourite foods were. Promised a handsome reward if she could get the son to return, the slave girl set off to Sāvattī with the necessary expenses and a large retinue.

²⁵⁴ Crosby 2014: Chapter 4.

Having arrived in Sāvatti, the slave-girl took up residence in the street where the monk frequently went to beg for alms-food. She provided the monk with the food and drink which the monk then favoured when on his alms-food round. When she saw that the monk did indulge in the taste of food, she feigned illness and made the monk enter her chamber when he visited her house for alms-food. Attached to the taste of food, the monk entered the place where a woman was lying, thus violating his rules.²⁵⁵

She told him the reason why she came to Sāvatti and the monk abandoned the monkhood because of his desire to indulge in the taste of food. Both of them with large following returned to Rājagaha where the monk's parents awaited them.²⁵⁶

This story clearly shows the peril caused by the attachment to the taste of food and describes how even an intelligent and ardent practitioner of the food-related *dhutaṅga* practices can have his religious tenacity destroyed by the growing pleasure he takes in food, as the slave girl repeatedly offers him his favourite dishes. He is then at the mercy of her will and his craving, once the now accustomed pleasure of the food to which he is attached is withdrawn.

The *jātaka* in the Pali Canon that illustrate the peril caused by attachment to the taste of food are summarised in the following table:

<i>Jātaka</i>	Protagonist	Food to which protagonist is attached	Result of obsession
14. <i>Vātamiga</i>	Monk	Favourite foods from home	Disrobes
138. <i>Godha</i>	Ascetic	lizard flesh	killing lizards for consuming the flesh (breaking the first precept)
255. <i>Suka</i>	Monk	Food	death by gluttony
407. <i>Mahākapi</i>	King	Mango	killing the monkeys which eat the mangoes (breaking the first precept)
423. <i>Indriya</i>	Monk	gruel and rice with palatable curry and sauces	loss of dignity as a monk
466. <i>Samudda-</i>	Carpenter	delicious food	the carpenter and his 500 families

²⁵⁵ *Pācittiya* 44th rule: If any *bhikkhus* sit in private on a secluded seat with a woman, it should be confessed; 45th rule: If any *bhikkhus* sit in private, along with a woman, it should be confessed.

²⁵⁶ J. I. pp. 157-158.

<i>vāṇija</i>			drown
511. <i>Kimchanda</i>	ascetic (former king)	Mango	not eating any food due to the attachment to the taste of mango
512. <i>Kumbha</i>	lay men	liquor and meat	cities in which the men consume liquor and meat excessively perish

Table 2.3. The perils of food in the *Jātaka*

This table shows the characters in these *jātaka*, through their attachment to the taste of food compromise their morality by killing animals, forfeit their dignity as monks and ascetics, lose their status or health, or find the place that they live is destroyed. In other words, attachment to the taste of food resulted in ethical, material and social problems, even to loss of life.

In the *Mahāyāna* text, the *Liudujijing* (六度集經), there is an account of an extreme case of the attachment to the taste of food. The text tells the story of a king who was wise and respectable, but indulged in the taste of flesh as follows:

There was a king who ruled over the kingdom righteously. He was powerful as a lion and was so fast that he could catch birds. One day, the cook at the court could find no animal flesh to cook, but he managed to prepare a dish for the king using the corpse of a human who had just died. This dish was much more palatable than that of animal flesh and the king rebuked the cook for the insipid food the cook had previously served when preparing dishes with animal flesh. The cook confessed to the king that this latest dish had been made with human flesh. Despite hearing where the dish came from, the King secretly ordered the cook to continue preparing meals made from human flesh.

The cook killed people and prepared the dishes for the king. The series of murders threw the kingdom into disorder. Officials investigated the murder cases and arrested the cook. The cook confessed that he killed people in order to prepare meals that the king wanted. The courtiers pleaded with the king to desist from such cruelty and to rule benevolently for his subjects, but the king refused their request. Such was his obsession, the

king ignored their plea and instead asked the courtiers if he might kill children for his food.

The courtiers reacted by ousting the king from the throne.²⁵⁷

In this text, the king is described as wise and righteous before his taste of human flesh. Because of his attachment to the taste of this particular type of meat, he loses his morality and his ability to rule. In this text the Buddha explains that someone who indulges in the taste of food is not generous, and that someone who is not generous could have a wicked mind like dholes and wolves. Having a wicked mind, he might steal and kill people. Therefore, he becomes the enemy to the world.²⁵⁸

The warning in this text is that the attachment to the taste of food could cause individual ethical problems and further social problems. Therefore, the Buddha advises that monks should realize the danger in food. He emphasises the appropriate attitude towards alms-food: monks should not “be attracted to it, infatuated with it or become attached to it.” The Buddha warns that if monks indulge in the pleasure of alms-food, their conduct might deteriorate such that they become malevolent and harmful to others. It seems that the Buddha thinks that detachment from the pleasures of food is conducive to the dispassionate, benevolent and vigilant mental attitudes which monks should cultivate.

The issue of the attachment to the taste of food in Buddhist texts is also addressed in the *Catuma Sutta*, *Majjhima Nikāya* 67. There, just as in the *Vāṭamiḡa Jātaka* discussed above, food is identified as a significant factor in the failure of some monks to stay in the Sangha. The *sutta* explains the four dangers which cause monks to forsake monasticism as follows:

The name given to the danger	The requirements under the <i>vinaya</i> that are the reason for abandoning the Sangha	Attachment to
------------------------------	--	---------------

²⁵⁷ T. III. p. 22b-c.

²⁵⁸ *ibid*: p. 22b.

1. Danger of crocodiles ²⁵⁹	The variety of foodstuffs is limited and food can be consumed only before noon.	gluttony
2. Danger of waves	A monk should respect and follow his senior monks, i.e. those who ordained before him, even if they are younger than him.	social status
3. Danger of whirlpools	Enjoying the five sense-pleasures of domestic life is prohibited	sensual pleasure
4. Danger of sharks	sexual activity is strictly prohibited	lust

Table 2.4. Four reasons which monks abandon their monasticism²⁶⁰

The *Catuma Sutta* mentions that monks could forsake monasticism for these four reasons. Among these, three derive from sensual causes, while one is about lacking the necessary humility thanks to the attachment to status. For some monks, the restrictions on the taste, quantity and the frequency with which food may be consumed could be the main difficulties they face in following the monastic life and cause them to leave.

2-7. Parallel Concerns in Christian Monasticism

Interestingly we can also see a similar viewpoint related to the attachment to food in Christianity. A Christian desert ascetic and theologian, John Cassian (360-435 C.E.) mentions that gluttony could cause monks to forsake monastic life.

²⁵⁹ The danger of waves is the first in the original order of these four reasons in the *Majjhima Nikāya*, but in order to emphasize the danger of crocodiles (gluttony), it is located first.

²⁶⁰ MN. III. p. 459-462.

1	Consuming food at unrighteous time	Ingestion at wrong time leads to the hate of the monotony of monastic life, increases the fear of monasticism and makes it unendurable to stay in the monastery.
2	Being satiated with food	Satiety is the surrendering of himself to the pleasure from quantity of food and causes lust.
3	Craving for sumptuous food	Desire for high quality food is to succumb to the pleasure from taste of food and this appetite is characterised by lavish food and special spices.

Table 2.5. Three types of gluttony²⁶¹

Gluttony is one of the seven deadly sins in Christianity, and Cassian's classification is more specific than that given in the Buddhist text examined above. He analyses the reasons for which monks abandon the monastic life into three aspects, i.e., time, quantity and taste. He understands that gluttony is the temptation which eliminates spiritual communion in the life of monastery and intensifies secularity, and that sumptuous food estranges religious practitioners from their spiritual pursuit. Another Christian desert ascetic, Evagrius (345-399 C.E.) maintains that for religious practitioners, bread, salt and water are appropriate foodstuffs and that gluttony is the first barrier which prevents practitioners from progressing in their religious practice.²⁶² He states that gluttony generates diseases, contaminates the intellect, weakens our bodies, makes us exhausted and is a source of adultery.²⁶³ He further says that in order to approach the path to God, it is extremely important that gluttony be overcome. He explains that gluttony is the first sin, that craving for food generates disobedience, and that the expulsion from the Garden of Eden was due to the sweet taste of food. Furthermore, he says that the more firewood the greater the fire, and that large quantities of food fatten desire.²⁶⁴

²⁶¹ Hill 2011: 136.

²⁶² *Ibid*: 129.

²⁶³ *Ibid*: 130.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid*: 127.

These Christian desert ascetics comprehend that gluttony is the first obstacle which religious practitioners should overcome in order to pursue spiritual ideals and to become successful in their practice. They also understand that gluttony in monasticism continues to endanger spiritual pursuits and to solidify secularity. Cassian further states that gluttony inevitably causes lust and destroys social stability and harmony.²⁶⁵ In addition to these, gluttony is also understood as irrational and impure in terms of value.²⁶⁶ Lastly, we can see a theological definition of gluttony which reveals the relationship between gluttony and ethics from St. Thomas Aquinas: “gluttony is a capital sin or vice because it deviates from ideal order for life in which ethical goodness should be exposed due to the excessive desire for the pleasure of food and eating.”²⁶⁷

2-8. From gluttony to lust

Along with gluttony, another of the major perils in which religious practitioners could indulge is lust. As we have seen earlier (when discussing the relationship between food and lust in Chapter 1), the *Aggañña Sutta* explains that the sex organs and lust are derived from food or eating. In this section, I shall not discuss lust in detail but offer a few examples of the ongoing association of the peril of lust in connection with gluttony.

We have seen in the previous section that food could cause various problems and perils to individuals. A further troublesome aspect of gluttony is that food functions as the cause of lust. While attachment to food is to be avoided by monks, indulgence in it does not lead to their exclusion from the Sangha. In contrast, sexual

²⁶⁵ *Ibid*: 134.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid*: 121.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid*: 124.

intercourse is one of the four *pārājikā* regulations, the breaking of which entails lifelong expulsion from the Sangha.

The *Aggañña Sutta* states that sexual organs are generated as a result of consuming food. In addition, the text describes the process of the generation of sexual organs and lust as follows:

Those beings, monks, spent a long time eating the rice which grew without cultivation, living on it as their food. According to how (much) these beings ate, so to an even greater degree did their bodies become hard, and good and bad looks become known. The female parts appeared in a woman, and the male parts in a man; the woman looked at the man with intense, excessive longing, as did the man at the woman. As they were looking at each other with intense longing passion arose in them, and burning came upon their bodies; because of this burning, they had sex.²⁶⁸

This text shows a successive chain of the three factors, food, sexual organs and lust. In Buddhist cosmology food and lust are innately connected.

The *Chengshi lun* (the *Satyasiddhi Śāstra*, 成實論) of the *Sammitīya* school says that attachment to food causes lust; lust causes mental defilements; mental defilements lead to unwholesome actions. This text remarks that all sufferings and pains are caused by the craving for food, and that food contributes to the generation of lust.²⁶⁹

The Sarvāstivāda text, the *Apidamodapiposhālun* (*Mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra*, 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論) connects ‘getting angry’ with female and male sex organs, the craving for material food, and lust:

There are female and male sex organs in the Realm of Desire

That is why there is the defilement of discontent.

This is because all sentient beings continue to cause discontent to the others due to the existence of organs of female and of male.

There is no defilement of discontent in the Realms of Form and of Formlessness because there are no female and male sex organs.

²⁶⁸ Collins 1993: 343-344.

²⁶⁹ T. XXXII. p. 348c.

There is the craving for material food.

That is why there is the defilement of discontent.

This is because all sentient beings continue to cause discontent due to the desire for material food.

There is no defilement of discontent in the Realms of Form and of Formlessness because there is no the desire of material food.

There is the defilement of lust.

That is why there is the defilement of discontent.

This is because all sentient beings continue to cause discontent due to the defilement of lust.

There is no defilement of discontent in the Realms of Form and of Formlessness because there is no defilement of lust.²⁷⁰

In this text, it is said that the craving for lust causes one of the three fundamental defilements, anger.²⁷¹ Here, the internal connection of the three factors, sex organs, gluttony and lust is shown through the defilement of anger. These three things 1) female and male organs, 2) craving for material food, and 3) lust, are the factors which characterize the Realm of Desire. According to the cosmology of the *Aggañña Sutta*, the craving for material food functions as the first cause for the universe evolving. This craving generates female and male sexual organs and as a result, lust is caused. These cravings continuously generate discontent and therefore, this world is defined as the Realm of Desire. However, the Realms of Form and of Formless do not have the existence of male and female, material food and lust and therefore, there the defilement of discontent does not occur there.

²⁷⁰ T. XXVII. p. 289a-b.

²⁷¹ Anger (*dosa*) is mentioned as one of three fundamental unwholesome roots with greed (*lobha*) and ignorance (*moha*) in the Pāli *Nikāya* which are obstacles to unshakable deliverance of mind (MN. I. 294) and cause evil unwholesome thought (MN. I. 119). The *Dīgha Nikāya* describes the defilement (*kilesa*) anger (*dosa*) as an obstacle or fire (DN. III. 217).

In daily alms-round, monks are exposed to two kinds of perils: gluttony and lust. The Chinese compilation of Buddhist texts, the *Jingluyixiang* (經律異相),²⁷² tells the following story to show how a monk faces the peril of lust which is generated during his alms round. A monk who thought that he had eliminated mental defilement goes to a tavern on his alms-round. When the hostess offered him alms-food, the sight of her generated lust within him. He took barley power and curd from his bowl and gave them to her. Seeing this, she also felt sexual desire and smiled at him showing her teeth. Even though he felt lust without touching her body and without talking with her, the sight of her smile, because of the teeth, prompted him to think of bones, one of the stages in the contemplation of impurity (*asubhabhāvanā*). Having contemplated that our whole body consists of bones, the monk achieved arahantship.²⁷³

We cite this text to show the way the need to acquire food can put monks in danger of experiencing lust. In this section, the *Chengshi lun* makes the connection between food and lust explicit, explaining the successive chain of factors as ‘food → lust → mental defilement → unwholesome state.’ In this chain, the *Apitamodapiposhalun* provides a clue to explain that the essential characteristic of the mental defilement is anger. We may say that the anger is another term for ‘discontent,’ since on seeing the attractive woman the monk becomes discontented

²⁷² The *Jingluyixiang* (經律異相) is the Buddhist text which has been established in the year of 516 C.E. in Liang dynasty of Southern Dynasties. The structure of this text is quite unique which consists of the extracts from various Buddhist texts of *sutra*, *vinaya* and *abhidharma*. This text comprises 39 divisions which include the topics from Heaven Division to Hell Division. Between the two divisions, there are various topics such as Buddha, *Bodhisattva*, *Śrāvaka*, kings, princes, populace, ghosts, beasts, birds, fishes and insects etc. This text includes extracts of the stories from the *Avadāna*, the *Jātaka* etc. Nakamura et al. 1989: 184.

²⁷³ T. LIII. p. 97c. This story originally occurs in the *Ayuwang jing* (阿育王經, T. L. p. 166c) which is the Chinese translation of the *Asokāvadāna*. A summary of this story also occurs in the *Fufazang Yinyuan zhuan* (付法藏因緣傳, T. L. p. 312b01-7). The information above was kindly provided to me by my examiner, Prof. Koichi Shinohara.

with his celibacy. His discontent or anger, as mental defilement, could cause him to commit sexual misconduct. However, in this case, his meditation, bringing to bear the insights of the meditation on the loathsomeness of the body at that very point of seeing its attraction, is the cause of his attainment of enlightenment. Thus there is not real danger for one who is sufficiently advanced on the path.

The examples from the Pali Canon to Mahāyāna literature show the ways in which food, though understood to be important for successful religious practice, is defined as perilous because of its association with craving and other vices. The following chapter will look at the precepts and regulations put in place in the *vinaya* to contain the risks to monks and the Sangha of the perils faced by the consumption and gathering of food.

2-9 Conclusion

In this chapter we built on the understanding of Buddhist cosmology explored in Chapter 1 to see how the understanding of the existence of food in the higher cosmological planes and before the decline of the universe feeds into the Buddhist attitude to food as an accepted component of renunciation. This is seen in the Buddha's rejection of existing renouncer attitudes to food, as portrayed in the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta* and *Mahāsakuludāyi Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*. Various advantages of food are identified, specifically the physical strength and mental calm necessary for meditation and attaining religious goals. Furthermore, the Buddha points out that plenty of his followers eat less than him, and are not more spiritually advanced. He thus undermines the existing association in some renouncer traditions between restriction on food and spiritual advancement. Nonetheless Buddhist literature from the Pali canon onwards also identifies that food can be a problem: it

can cause attachment, lead to lust, lead one into various problematic social contexts, lead monks to give up the monkhood because they miss food; and, eaten in excess, it harms health. Thus different kinds of practice and literature, such as the extra *dhutaṅga*, permitted ascetic practices, and the *jātaka* tales warn of these problems and provide a means for dealing with them. We examined in detail different versions of the ascetic practices which are seen as ways for those with problems in these areas to address and overcome them. We also find that the Buddha is shown to introduce rules that ensure moderation in eating for all monks, namely eating only once a day or not eating after noon. Three reasons are given for this: health, saving time that could be better spent on practice and the avoidance of problematic social contexts and dangers through traveling late on an alms round. The importance of food and moderation in eating found in early Buddhism is then extended in later forms of Buddhism, where more detailed analyses of the effects of different foods on health and on the ability to meditate are offered. Again, we see an ongoing emphasis on the need to avoid the extremes of minimum and maximum food consumption, as well as an ongoing association of food with lust. This last association related to understandings of the physical body in cosmological development in early Buddhism. As Buddhism develops, this understanding is retained, while being further built on in relation to the engagement in social contexts necessitated by searching for food, which thus risks the possibility of being attracted to someone met on the almsround. We also see a link made between craving for food or sex and the development of discontent or anger. Having noted attitudes to food found mainly in *sutta* and related texts, in the next chapter we shall turn to the detailed food regulations found in the *vinaya* literature for monks.

Chapter Three

Vinaya Regulations concerning Food

In the previous chapter we examined how Buddhist monasticism took a different approach to food from that of other renouncer groups, despite the craving for food being identified in the Buddhist cosmology of the *Aggañña Sutta* as the primary agent in the deterioration of the universe and of morality. Although the consumption of coarse food was also presented as a causal factor in the development of sexual differentiation and lust, the Buddha did not correlate the minimization of food with the level of renunciation or spiritual development of the renouncer, unlike other renouncer traditions of ancient India. This was for two main reasons: because he regarded the strength to be gained from food as necessary for spiritual success and because he regarded it as possible to participate in food without craving. For Buddhism, craving itself is the problem and the enlightened do not experience it.

But what of those who are not enlightened? We saw in the previous chapter that some limitations were set on the consumption of food. The limitation was not on the amount or type of food, although it was permitted for monks to undertake extra restrictive practice to combat attachment to food (See chapter. 2). Rather, the rule was on eating after noon. This was justified not as a response to craving, although it did – as Udāyin pointed out – mean that they were not seeking food at the time of day when the ‘best’ or tastiest meals were prepared. Rather, the rule was justified on the basis of the perils of wandering for food at night, the perceived health benefits of not eating late, and – possibly – the disruption to practice caused by seeking food so often.

Nonetheless, we also saw that plenty of narratives of the *Sutta Piṭaka* and later treatises not only presented the ideal approach to food, but also the misfortunes in store for those who fall short of it. Warnings against the perils posed by food told not

only of the craving for food itself, but also of further problematic behaviour to which surrendering to one's cravings could lead. In some later Buddhist traditions, to emphasise the importance of moderation, the potential medical problems were expanded upon. Meditating monks were warned to veer neither to the extreme of abstinence nor to that of indulgence. So problematic did attachment to food among monks turn out to be in practice, according to the canonical texts, that it was identified as one of four main causal factors in monks deciding to leave the Sangha. For the Buddha, the *vinaya*, or monastic legal code, was the answer.

If, monks, you observe the training in full, you will attain your object in full. If you observe partially, you will attain your object partially. I must emphasise that three rules of training do not fail to work.²⁷⁴

Of the 227 *pāṭimokkha* rules in the Pali *pāṭimokkha sutta* that govern the lives of individual monks and make up this training, 50 rules – almost a quarter – concern food. Of the 311 *pāṭimokkha* rules in the Pali *pāṭimokkha* that govern the lives of individual nuns 54 rules – almost a sixth – concern food.

As with all the other rules of the *pāṭimokkha*, every one of the rules about food is attributed to the Buddha, the ultimate authority in the *Vibhaṅga*. The *Vibhaṅga* is the 'commentary' or section of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* that explains the establishment of such rules. In this chapter we shall examine the *pāṭimokkha* rules about food, examining the concerns made apparent by the *Vibhaṅga*'s account of how each was established. If we compare the different extant *vinaya* texts, they sometimes give slightly different rules and often offer different background stories. We shall therefore compare a range of *vinaya* texts for evidence of the various concerns that the monastic community felt the need to address during the period when the *vinaya* were being encoded.

3-1. The Place of Food Rules in the *Vinaya*

²⁷⁴ AN. I. p. 234, cited Huxley 1996: 144.

We shall begin by looking at how the rules which relate to minimising the craving for food or to avoiding problems with lay society in procuring food fit into the overall system of *vinaya* rules, turning first to the list of rules found in the *pāṭimokkha* *sutta* of Pali *vinaya*. Table 3-1 lists the *pāṭimokkha* rules according to the standard classification which categorises them by decreasing severity of offense, i.e. starting with the four rules requiring expulsion or ‘defeats’, the *pārājikā* offenses, and ending with the rules that are about training, mainly to do with appropriate decorum, with no specific penalty beyond opprobrium. The right hand side of the table indicates how many rules relating to food come under that section.

	The monastic code (<i>pāṭimokkha</i>) for monks (227 rules)	The rules related to food
1.	4 Defeats (<i>pārājika</i>)	
2.	13 Remaining (<i>saṅghādisesa</i>)	
3.	2 Undetermined (<i>aniyata</i>)	
4.	30 Confession with forfeiture (<i>nissaggiya pācittiya</i>)	No. 23 (1 rule), prohibition of storing beyond 7 days.
5.	92 Expiation (<i>pācittiya</i>)	Nos. 31-40, which are collectively termed the Food Section and nos. 29, 41, 42, 43 and 51 (15 rules)
6.	4 Confession (<i>pāṭidesanīya</i>)	Nos. 1-4 (4 rules)
7.	75 Trainings (<i>sekhiya</i>)	Nos. 27-56 (30 rules)
8.	7 Resolutions of disagreements (<i>adhikaraṇasamatha</i>)	

Table 3.1. *Bhikkhu* rules related to food in the *pāṭimokkha*.

	The monastic code (<i>Pāṭimokkha</i>) for nuns (311 rules)	The rules related to food
1.	8 Defeats (<i>pārājika</i>)	

2.	17 Remaining (<i>saṅghādisesa</i>)	Nos. 5-6 (2 rules), prohibition of accepting food from men who have lust
3.	30 Confession with forfeiture (<i>nissaggiya pācittiya</i>)	No. 25 (1 rule), prohibition of storing beyond than 7 days.
4.	166 Expiation (<i>pācittiya</i>)	Nos. 117-126, collectively termed the 'Food Section' along with No. 1, the rule on garlic, No. 7, the rule on raw grain, and No.132, the rule on drinking liquor, (13 rules)
6.	8 Confession (<i>pāṭidesanīya</i>)	Nos. 1-8 (8 rules)
7.	75 Trainings (<i>sekhiya</i>)	Nos. 27-56 (30 rules)
8.	7 Resolutions of disagreements (<i>adhikaraṇasamatha</i>)	

Table 3.2. *Bhikkhunī* rules related to food in the *pātimokkha*.

Correct behaviour in relation to eating is represented in the ten precepts incumbent on monks and nuns: the precept not to eat at the wrong time, i.e. after noon: *vikālabhojanā veramaṇī sikkhāpadaṃ samādiyāmi*. It might therefore seem surprising that in terms of the *pātimokkha* rules the issue of eating comes low down in the hierarchy of relative severity. Within the structure of the *pātimokkha* rules provided in the tables above, the regulations related to food are located mainly in the Expiation (*pācittiya*), Confession (*pāṭidesanīya*) and Training (*sekhiya*) sections. These are the less serious regulations. The placing of food low down in the list conforms with the views attributed to the Buddha in the *suttas* examined in the previous chapter, that restriction on eating is not an indicator of progress as a renouncer, that the issue is relatively minor. Nonetheless, food is an issue that has to be dealt with on a daily basis and the rules in these categories are closely concerned with the daily life of monks and nuns. Moreover, the 75 *sekhiya* rules are largely about decorum, describing how

monks should behave in day to day matters and how they should appear. Unlike the rest of the *vinaya*, they are also prescribed for novices, alongside the 10 precepts.

The total number of rules concerning food in the *vinaya* is relatively high, at 50 for monks, i.e. over 20% of the total number of rules. In the *bhikkhunī pāṭimokkha* there are some rules relating to food that apply solely to nuns: in the Remaining (*saṅghādisesa*) there are two rules, Nos. 5 and 6, in the Expiation (*pācittiya*) section there are two rules, Nos. 1 and 7, and in the Confession (*pāṭidesanīya*) section there are eight rules (Nos. 1-8), that are not found in the rules for monks. These rules show that food regulations for nuns are stricter than those which apply to monks. These rules for nuns shall be investigated in the chapter 4, and the main focus here is on the *vinaya* for monks.

3-2. The Ten Expiation rules (*pācittiya*) concerning Food

There are 92 regulations in the Expiation (*pācittiya*) category in the Pali *vinaya*. The penalty for breaking a rule in the expiation section is the monk who has broken the rule must confess his sins (*desanā*) in front of monks who do not violate precepts.²⁷⁵ Ten of these rules, Nos. 31-40 are commonly referred to collectively as the ‘Food Chapter’, dealing with a number of food issues in monastic life.²⁷⁶ The ten rules of the food chapter are as follows:

31. A *bhikkhu* who is not ill may eat one meal at a public alms center. If he eats more than that, it is to be confessed.²⁷⁷

32. A group meal, except one taken at one of the proper occasions, is to be confessed. The proper occasions are these: a time of illness, a time of giving cloth, a time of making robes, a

²⁷⁵ Vin. IV. p. 15.

²⁷⁶ Hirakawa 1994: 341.

²⁷⁷ Vin. IV. p. 70. *agilānena bhikkhunā eko āvasathapiṇḍo bhuñjitabbo tato ce uttarim bhuñjeyya pācittiyam.*

time of going on a journey, a time of embarking on a boat, a great occasion, a time when the meal is supplied by contemplatives. These, only, are the proper occasions.²⁷⁸

33. An out-of-turn meal, except one taken at one of the proper occasions for them, is to be confessed. The proper occasions are these: a time of illness, a time of giving cloth, a time of making robes. These, only, are the proper occasions.²⁷⁹

34. In the case of a *bhikkhu* calling at a family residence and being presented with cakes or cooked grain-meal, he may accept two or three bowlfuls if he so desires. If he accepts more than that, it is to be confessed. Having accepted the two-or-three bowlfuls and having departed with them, he is to share them amongst other *bhikkhus*. Only this is the proper course of action.²⁸⁰

35. Should any *bhikkhu*, having already eaten and having turned down the offer of further food, chew or consume food, staple or non-staple, that is not left over, it is to be confessed.²⁸¹

36. Should any *bhikkhu*, deliberately attempting to incite a fault, present staple or non-staple food he has brought to a *bhikkhu* who has eaten and turned down an offer of further food, saying, "Here, *bhikkhu*, chew or consume this" — once it has been eaten, it is to be confessed.²⁸²

37. Should any *bhikkhu* chew or consume staple or non-staple food at the wrong time, it is to be confessed.²⁸³

38. Should any *bhikkhu* chew or consume staple or non-staple food that has been stored up, it is to be confessed.²⁸⁴

²⁷⁸ Vin. IV. p. 74. gaṇabhojane aññatra samayā pācittiyaṃ. Tatthāyaṃ samayo gilānasamayo cīvaradānasamayo cīvarakārasamayo addhānagamanasamayo nāvābhirūhanasamayo mahāsamayo samaṇabhattachasamayo ayaṃ tattha samayo.

²⁷⁹ Vin. IV. p. 77. paraṃparabhojane aññatra samaya pācittiyaṃ. Tatthāyaṃ samayo gilānasamayo cīvaradānasamayo cīvarakārasamayo. Ayaṃ tattha samayo.

²⁸⁰ Vin. IV. p. 80. bhikkhuṃ paṇ'eva kulaṃ upagataṃ pūvehi vā manthehi vā abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya ākaṅkhamānena bhikkhunā dvittipattapūrā paṭiggahetabbā. Tato ce uttariṃ paṭiggāṇheyya pācittiyaṃ.

²⁸¹ Vin. IV. p. 82. yo pana bhikkhu bhuttāvi pavārito anatirittaṃ khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā pācittiyaṃ.

²⁸² Vin. IV. p. 84. yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhuṃ bhuttāviṃ pavāritaṃ anatirittena khādaniyena vā bhojaniyena vā abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya "handa bhikkhu khāda vā bhuñja vā" ti jānaṃ āsādanāpekko bhuttasmiṃ pācittiyaṃ.

²⁸³ Vin. IV. p. 85. yo pana bhikkhu vikāle khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā pācittiyaṃ.

²⁸⁴ Vin. IV. p. 87. yo pana bhikkhu sannidhikāraṃ khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya va pācittiyaṃ.

39. These are the finer staple foods: ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, sugar/molasses, fish, meat, milk, and curds. Should any *bhikkhu* who is not ill having request finer staple foods such as these for his own sake and then consume them, it is to be confessed.²⁸⁵

40. Should any *bhikkhu* take into his mouth anything edible that has not been given to him, it is, except for water and tooth-cleaning sticks, to be confessed²⁸⁶

The 31st rule in the Expiation (*pācittiya*) section in the Pali *vinaya* is related to the issue of food which proscribes monks from consuming a meal more than once at a public food centre.

“31. A *bhikkhu* who is not ill may eat one meal at a public alms centre. If he eats more than that, it is to be confessed.”²⁸⁷

First of all, let us see the story of the establishment of the rule from the Pali *vinaya*:

In Sāvattthī, a charitable guild was preparing alms-food at a public food centre. The Group of Six Monks, wearing their robes and carrying their bowls, entered Sāvattthī to go on the alms-round, but on failing to be given any, they went to the public food centre to acquire a meal. They returned there the next day and the day after that. Then they thought, we will go home to the monastery only to return to this public food centre tomorrow. What is the difference [between staying here overnight and going only to return here tomorrow]? So they stayed at the public food centre and continued to consume meals there, unlike renouncers of other traditions who went away. For their behaviour people accused them thus:

²⁸⁵ Vin. IV. p. 88. yāni kho pana tāni paṇṭabhojanāni seyyath’ īdaṃ sappi, navanītaṃ, telaṃ, madhu, phāṇitaṃ, maccho, maṃsaṃ, khīraṃ, dadhi, yo pana bhikkhu evarūpāni paṇṭabhojanāni agilāno attano atthāya viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya pācittiyaṃ.

²⁸⁶ Vin. IV. p. 90. yo pana bhikkhu adinnaṃ mukhadvāraṃ āhāraṃ āhareyya aññatra udakadantapoṇā pācittiyaṃ. Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015. The English translations of all 10 *pācittiya* rules here are by Thanissaro.

²⁸⁷ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

“How can the monks, the son of Śākya, continue to stay at the public food centre and consume meals? Alms-food at the public food centre is not only for them, but for everybody.” [... As a result of this event,] the Buddha declared that if a monk consumes a meal more than once at a public food centre, there is an offense requiring Expiation.²⁸⁸

The public food centre seems important in understanding the establishment of this rule. The Pali rule allows one meal at a public food centre. The *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya* has the same as the Pali rule, in which one meal is allowed at a public food centre.²⁸⁹ The *Mahīśāsaka vinaya* also mentions the same as these two *vinayas*.²⁹⁰ But what is the function of a public food centre? We have already seen that it has the function of donating food to renunciators. The *Sarvāstivāda vinaya* uses the expression, ‘a house bringing merit (福德舍)’ instead of ‘public food centre’. This text defines the house bringing merit as the place where only a night stay and a meal are supposed to be offered.²⁹¹

Samyuktāgama 403 mentions that the Buddha stayed one night with his monks at ‘a house bringing merit’ built by the Magadha king.²⁹² Another *sūtra*, *Samyuktāgama* 997, describes the merit for building ‘a house bringing merit’, digging wells and planting trees for travellers, and making bridges and ferries for crossing rivers.²⁹³ The *Sarvāstivāda vinaya* says of the ‘house bringing merit:

when *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa* come to the ‘house bringing merit’, lay followers go and welcome them and then pay respect to them. The lay followers wash their feet with warm water and apply oil to them....next day the lay followers offer fragrant and palatable appetizer, dessert and main dishes with respect.²⁹⁴

²⁸⁸ Vin. IV. pp. 69-70. Translation adapted from I B. Horner 1993: 303.

²⁸⁹ T. XXII. p. 351c.

²⁹⁰ *ibid.* p. 51b.

²⁹¹ T. XXIII. p. 89c.

²⁹² T. II. p. 108a.

²⁹³ *ibid.* p. 261b.

²⁹⁴ T. XXIII. p. 89c.

To sum up, a public food centre (also called ‘a house bringing merit’) is set up to provide *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa* with lodging and a meal. As we have seen above, various classes of people, a king, guilds, individuals, build ‘a public food centre or house bringing merit’ to earn merit. According to these texts, it seems that monks had plural options to obtain a meal. The Group of Six Monks failed to procure a meal on their alms round, but after that, the Six Monks visited the public food centre. It seems that monks could obtain food through at least invitation meals, regular alms rounds and public food centres.²⁹⁵

In this rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*), the Group of Six Monks, representative of self-indulgence, are described as going to the public food centre to obtain food having failed to acquire any alms food that day. This behaviour seems to be accepted as reasonable. The reason why they continued to stay at the public food centre is not stated explicitly, though they do mention seeing no point in making round trips between the monastery and the public food centre. They decide to stay put. What is clearly expressed here is that the Group of Six Monks continued to stay at the public food centre out of laziness, to enjoy the convenience of a stable supply of food without the effort and uncertainty of going on an alms round. The rule, however, does not make the connection between this rule and the craving for the flavour or quantity of food explicit. We can glean more information on this topic by looking at the presentation of this same rule in the *vinaya* of other Buddhist schools. Let us refer to the 31st rule of the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, which is equivalent to the 31st rule in the Pali Expiation (*pācittiya*) section:

The Buddha was staying at Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery in Jeta Grove in Sāvattthī. At that time, there was a village in Kosala which had no place for monks to stay. The laymen at the village constructed a hostel where monks could stay and be provided with food. Anyone who stayed

²⁹⁵ There are in detailed classification of methods of obtaining alms food and of eating ways in the later part of this section on the Pali *pācittiya* 40.

there could obtain alms-food. Presently, the Group of Six Monks wished to go to the village in Kosala. Having arrived, they received palatable and sumptuous meals. Because of this they stayed on for a second day and again obtained palatable and sumptuous food. It occurred to the Group of Six Monks, ‘The reason we wander is purely due to food. Now that we have found a place which has what we desire, let’s satiate our appetite.’ At this all the lay people mocked and despised the Six Monks, saying, these monks, sons of Śākya, did not know satisfaction and shame. They said that they knew righteous Dharma, but for them, where was the righteous Dharma?” They frequently obtain food at our public food centre. It looks like we will continue to provide them with food, but originally we intended to offer food only to those practitioners who stay here just one night.²⁹⁶

Unlike the 31st rule of the Pali Expiation (*pācittiya*) section, the 31st rule of the Dharmaguptaka Expiation (*pācittiya*) section states explicitly that the reason the Group of Six Monks wander is to obtain palatable and sumptuous food. The Group of Six Monks states that the reason why they continue to stay at the public food centre is because the food is good. Whereas in the Pali version the emphasis appears to be on the effort required to go on the alms round, here, while that effort is mentioned, it is the quality of the food that is emphasised. In this case, then, the rule aims to control both behaviour consequent to the craving for palatable and sumptuous food, and the laziness regarding wandering for alms. In this Dharmaguptaka version of the 31st rule of Expiation immediately after the story cited above, we find another set of monks, who have the opposite characteristics to the Group of Six Monks. The exemplary monks are described as those who are easily satisfied and free of greed, who perform the permitted ascetic practices (*dhutaṅga*, see Chapter 2), who enjoy learning the virtues, and who know shame.²⁹⁷ It seems that the description of these exemplary monks functions as a device which shows positive deportment in relation to rules, in contradistinction to that behaviour which is an infringement of this *pācittiya* rule.

²⁹⁶ T. XXII. p. 655a. Author’s translation.

²⁹⁷ *ibid.*

“32. A group meal, except one taken at one of the proper occasions, is to be confessed.

The proper occasions are these: a time of illness, a time of giving cloth, a time of making robes, a time of going on a journey, a time of embarking on a boat, a great occasion, a time when the meal is supplied by renouncers. These are the only proper occasions.”²⁹⁸

The 32nd rule requiring Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Pali *vinaya* is the regulation that monks should not take alms food prepared with one of the five kinds of foodstuffs from laymen in a group of more than four.²⁹⁹ Here, food which is prepared with the one of the five kinds of foodstuffs, which means a full meal and not a snack. The five kinds of foodstuffs which are considered as a full meal by the five major Buddhist *vinaya* as follows:

Pali	Dharmaguptaka	Mahāsāṃghika		Mahīśāsaka	Sarvāstivāda	
steamed rice (<i>odana</i>)	steamed rice (飯)	steamed rice (飯)	steamed rice (飯)	steamed rice (飯) or dried rice (乾飯)	steamed rice (飯)	steamed rice (飯)
barley powder (<i>sattu</i>)	barley powder (麩)	barley powder (麩)	barley powder (麩)	barley powder (麩)	barley powder (麩)	barley powder (麩),
fish (<i>maccha</i>)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)
meat (<i>maṃsa</i>)	meat (肉)	meat (肉)	meat (肉)	meat (肉)	meat (肉)	meat (肉)
gruel (<i>kummāsa</i>) ³⁰⁰	dried rice (乾飯) ³⁰¹	noodle (麵) In vol. 15 ³⁰²	steamed barley (麥飯) In vol.	cake (餅) ³⁰⁴	cake (餅) In vol. 8 ³⁰⁵	dried rice (糲) In vols. 13 ³⁰⁶ &

²⁹⁸ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

²⁹⁹ Vin. IV. p. 74.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.* p. 83.

³⁰¹ T. XXII. p. 656b.

³⁰² *ibid.* p. 350c.

			16 ³⁰³			56 ³⁰⁷
--	--	--	-------------------	--	--	-------------------

Table 3.3. The five kinds of foodstuffs defined by the five major Buddhist *vinayas*.

In the seven cases, a group meal is allowed to monks as follows:

1. A group meal is allowed when a monk is ill
2. A group meal is allowed at a time of giving robes.
3. A group meal is allowed at a time of making robes.
4. A group meal is allowed at a time of a journey.
5. A group meal is allowed at a time of boarding a boat.
6. A group meal is allowed at a time of a great gathering
7. A group meal is allowed at a meal time of religious renouncer.³⁰⁸

This may seem surprising given the number of times we read of the Buddha being invited with a large following to a group meal in the *Sutta Piṭaka*. Such occasions are the frame stories for famous episodes, such as the meal from the courtesan Ambapālī in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*, which provides the advice that one does not discard a formerly accepted invitation when a more prestigious one comes along. The Buddha keeps his appointment with Ambapālī to the chagrin of the Licchavis. They had attempted to invite him after he had accepted Ambapālī's invitation, and had tried to bribe Ambapālī to allow them to provide the meal rather than her. In the same *sutta* is the story of the group meal provided by the blacksmith Chanda at which the Buddha asks Chanda to put aside some food, which he knows to be poisonous, just for him, i.e. the meal from which he will die.³⁰⁹ Now let us look at the background stories to this rule, in the Pali *vibhaṅga*.

³⁰⁴ T. XXII. p. 52c.

³⁰⁵ T. XXIII. p. 56a.

³⁰⁶ *ibid.* p. 9b.

³⁰³ T. XXII. p. 354c.

³⁰⁷ T. XXIII. p. 416a.

³⁰⁸ Vin. IV. pp. 71-73.

³⁰⁹ DN. II. p. 127.

Around that time, Devadatta, whose reputation was in decline, dined with his followers at the squirrels' feeding place of the Bamboo Grove in Rājagaha, having repeatedly requested luxurious food from lay people news of this spread through the laity and people asked, how can these monks, sons of Śākyans, repeatedly request lay people for food and then consume it with his followers? ... A group meal is an offence requiring Expiation (*pācittiya*).³¹⁰

Like the Group of Six Monks, Devadatta, the cousin of the Buddha, is the archetypal villain. Usually his misdeeds indicate his jealousy of the Buddha, and it has been posited that he was in fact the leader of a rival religious group.³¹¹ This 32nd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in Pali *vinaya* states that Devadatta with his follower monks repeatedly asks lay people for flavorsome food. The lay people criticise the behaviour of Devadatta and his follower monks for asking for luxurious food. Through this remark, we learn why this rule is established. The 33rd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, which is the equivalent to the 32nd rule in the Pali *vinaya*, offers a background story for this rule:

The Buddha was staying at the Vulture Peak mountain (Gṛdhrakūṭa) in Rājagṛha. At that time, Devadatta abetted [attempted] murder against the Buddha and also instigated Ajātaśatru to kill his father, King Bimbisara. On this account, he achieved notoriety and material support from laity dropped away. Then, he took alms round house by house with five monks. ...

At that time, other monks heard that Devadatta abetted in murdering the Buddha, in addition to this, he also had Ajātaśatru kill his father, King Bimbisara, he had gained notoriety and then, took alms round with five monks house by house.

Then those monks went to the place of the Buddha, saluted him and sat in one corner.

[The monks] reported these happenings to the Buddha. Having heard them from the monks, the Buddha summoned a meeting of monks and deliberately asked Devadatta.

“Have you, Devadatta, taken alms round with five monks house by house?” [Devadatta answered] “That is true, Blessed One.” Then, the Buddha rebuked Devadatta with various ways and said, “you have done wrong things, not decent, not the etiquette of renouncers, not pure

³¹⁰ Vin. IV. p. 70. Translation adapted from I B. Horner 1993: 306.

³¹¹ Huxley 1996: 162.

action, not actions which follow the teaching of the Buddha and not the action which you should not commit.” [The Buddha again asked Devadatta] “Did you, Devadatta, take alms round with five monks house by house?” “Devadatta, I had given benefits and loving-kindness to lay followers with various expedients. How could you, foolish Devadatta, take alms round with five monks house by house!” Having rebuked Devadatta with various ways, the Buddha said to the monks. ... If a monk takes a group meal, that contravenes the Expiation rule.³¹²

In this 33rd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* the remark about sumptuous food which is mentioned in the 32nd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in Pali *vinaya* is not seen. Here it seems that the Buddha criticises Devadatta for his and his follower monks’ imposing a heavy burden on the lay people by a group alms round.

The 32nd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya*, which is the equivalent to the 32nd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in Pali *vinaya*, also states the similar background story of a group meal:

The Buddha was staying in Rājagaha. At that time, Devadatta had a lay family invite four or five or ten monks for a meal. Elderly monks rebuked the monks who took the group meal, “Why did you, monks, support Devadatta and take the group meal?” The elders reported this matter to the Buddha. Due to this matter, the Buddha summoned monks and asked the monks who took the group meal, “Did you, monks, truly take the group meal for which Devadatta individually asked?” The monks answered, “That was true, Blessed One.” The Buddha rebuked those monks in various ways and said to monks,... “If a monk takes a group meal, he should confess”.³¹³

It also seems that the background story of the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* criticises Devadatta and his follower monks for their imposed burden to the laity. We can conjecture the lay people’s burden from the statement that “Devadatta had a lay family invite four or five or ten monks for a meal.”

In the background stories of a group meal, the three *vinayas*, the Pali, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka *vinayas*, have some facts in common:

³¹² T. XXII. p. 657c. Author’s translation.

³¹³ *Ibid.* p. 50b. Author’s translation.

- 1) mentioning Devadatta and his follower monks,
- 2) a connection between Devadatta and his follower monks and a group meal,
- 3) summoning monks by the Buddha (except for the Pali *vinaya*).

It seems quite natural that we should conjecture that these facts may show dissent in the Order. In order to find further clues to support this suspicion, we can look at the 36th rule of the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, which is equivalent to the 32nd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in Pali *vinaya*:

The Buddha was staying in Rājagaha. At that time, the King, Ajātaśatru, his vassals and military generals followed Devadatta. People supported Devadatta and provided him with meals which included an appetizer, a dessert and a drink made of barley powder. ... Devadatta entered Rājagṛha with 100 or 200 or 300 or 400 or 500 monks who respected and escorted him and took a sumptuous meal which included an appetizer, a dessert and a drink made of barley powder. ...

When many elderly monks, who understood the profound meaning of the Buddha's teaching and had cultivated purity for a long time, entered [the city] and took alms food, they would either obtain one-night-old-rice or not procure any. Thus [they] would either satisfy their hunger or not fill their stomach. [They] would either obtain spoiled food made of barley or not procure any. Thus, [they] would satisfy their hunger or not fill their stomach with coarse food.

A monk who had little greed and knew satisfaction heard about this matter [concerning Devadatta and his monks] and was far from pleased. ... He reported it to the Buddha and the Buddha summoned the monks on account of this matter. The Buddha rebuked [them] with various reasons as follows: "How could a monk enter Rājagaha with 100 or 200 or 300 or 400 or 500 monks who respect and escort him and take a sumptuous meal with which was also served an appetizer, a dessert and a drink made of barley powder? When many elderly monks, who understood the profound meaning of the Buddha's teaching and had cultivated purity for long time, entered [the city] and took alms food, they would either obtain one-night-old-rice or not procure any. Thus [they] would either satisfy their hunger or not fill their stomach. [They] would either obtain spoiled food made of barley or not procure any. Thus, [they] would satisfy their hunger or not fill their stomach." [He] rebuked them with various reasons and said to the monks, "We should prohibit a group meal in which more than 3 monks consume food, for two reasons: the first reason was to protect lay followers with loving-kindness towards them; and

the second reason was to destroy the power and influence of the malevolent and greedy monks and to make them unable to establish their Saṅgha and doctrine and be unable to conflict with established Saṅgha. ... If a monk takes a group meal, that contravenes the rule of Expiation.³¹⁴

This 36th rule of the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* also states that the reason why a group meal is prohibited is to protect lay followers from the burden offering meals to a group of monks, but here more importantly, we come to hear the Buddha's remark that the ban of a group meal is also aimed at preventing monks from splitting the Saṅgha. In this paragraph, the Buddha explicitly states that the prohibition of a group meal is aimed at making malevolent and greedy monks unable to establish their Saṅgha (*karmabheda*) and doctrine (*cakrabheda*). *Saṅghabheda* (splitting the Saṅgha) covers these two areas of dissent. *Karmabheda* signifies that monks within the same ritual area (*sīmā*) perform separate religious ceremonies, such as the *upavasatha*. This is considered a substantial splitting of community harmony and the establishment of a new Order. On the other hand, *cakrabheda* is to establish another doctrine in contradistinction to the teaching of the Buddha.³¹⁵ These two terms together make up the concept of *saṅghabheda*. However, *saṅghabheda* shows some variation according to different Buddhist *vinayas*. In the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*, only *karmabheda* constitutes *saṅghabheda*³¹⁶, whereas in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, only *cakrabheda* signifies *saṅghabheda*.³¹⁷ On the other hand, in the Pali, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka *vinaya*, the definition of the *saṅghabheda* encompasses both concepts, i.e. *karmabheda* and *cakrabheda*.³¹⁸

To sum up, even though in the 32nd rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Pali *vinaya* Devadatta and his follower monks behave indecently on account of sumptuous

³¹⁴ T. XXIII. p. 93c. Author's translation.

³¹⁵ Vin. II. pp. 180-206; T. XXII. pp. 590b-596c; T. XXII. pp. 16c-21c; T. XXII. pp.281c-284c; T. XXIII. pp. 24b-26b.

³¹⁶ T. XXII. p. 489c.

³¹⁷ T. XXIII. p. 266b.

³¹⁸ Vin. II. p. 204; T. XXII. p. 913b; T. XXII. 166a.

food, the aim of this rule which prohibits a group meal for more than four monks is related to prevent greedy and wicked monks from imposing material burden on the laity laity and from undermining the established Sangha.

“33. An out-of-turn meal, except one taken at one of the proper occasions for them, is to be confessed. The proper occasions are these: a time of illness, a time of giving cloth, a time of making robes. These, only, are the proper occasions.”³¹⁹

The 33rd *pācittiya* in the Pali *vinaya* says a monk should not accept an invited meal immediately after another meal.³²⁰ We notice that this rule is related to the quantity of food than the flavour of food. Let us look at the story of the establishment of this rule in order to investigate the reason behind it:

When the Buddha was at the Gabled Roof of the Great Grove in Vesālī, at that time, palatable food was prepared by different people in turn in Vesālī. A poor worker thought “there would be nothing inferior in a meal which people prepare with their utmost sincerity.”...

The poor worker went to (his master) Kirapatika, and said to him “master, I would like to prepare a meal for the Order of monks with the enlightened one at the head. Please give me my wages.”... Kirapatika was a faithful and virtuous man and he gave the worker more than his wages.

Then, the worker went to the Enlightened one... the poor man asked the Enlightened one “would you please consent to a meal with me tomorrow?”

The Enlightened showed his assent by remaining silent...

People heard of this and said to themselves, “the Order of monks with the Enlightened one at the head has been invited to a meal by the poor worker.” And they helped by providing many types of solid food and soft food for the poor worker. In due course the poor worker informed the Enlightened one that food was ready.

³¹⁹ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> On 20/6/2015.

³²⁰ Vin. IV. p. 77.

Then the Enlightened one, wearing robes and carrying his bowl, went to the poor worker's home. ... As the poor worker served the monks, they said to him "please give me only a little, give me only a little." The poor man replied "Do not accept only so little. Plenty of food, solid and soft, has been prepared, reverend sirs, please accept as much as you would like." "It is for no other reason than for the fact that we ate already, before coming here for alms-food this morning. That is the reason why we accept so little." For this the poor worker despised and criticised the monks. He spread the story of what had happened, saying "how can these monks eat elsewhere when they were supposed to come and eat a meal at my place by prior invitation." ... The Buddha, rebuked the monks and laid down the rule that it is an offence requiring Expiation (*pācittiya*) to eat a meal in advance of an invited meal.³²¹

In this story the monks who were invited to the meal confess that they had already eaten before they arrived at the residence of the poor worker to which they had been invited for a meal. Perhaps they were afraid that they would not get enough food at a meal hosted by a poor person, so they ate ahead of time and then found themselves overwhelmed by the feast that the poor man, having been given help both by his boss and by other well-wishers, had offered. In the 31st rule for Expiation of the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya*, which is the equivalent to the 33rd Pali *pācittiya*, the monks confess explicitly the reason they ate food before arriving at the poor man's house:

When the Buddha stayed in Rājagaha, there lived a poor worker. He wished that he could invite the Buddha and the monks for a meal, like many others did, but he was a just poor worker. He decided to save his wages so he could invite the Buddha and the monks. Having saved enough money to be able to prepare sufficient food for inviting the Buddha and his monks, the poor worker asked his master to prepare food for him to invite the Buddha and his monks. His master was deeply touched by his staunch devotion to the Buddha and the monks and helped him by paying him several times his wages. When the poor worker visited the place of the Buddha and offered the most delicious food in the world, even ghosts (*quishen*, 鬼神) were moved by his devotion and helped him. At that time, it was festival time at Rājagaha and many laymen invited

³²¹ Vin. IV. pp. 76-77. Translation adapted from I B. Horner 1993: 315-317.

the monks for meals. The monks tried to consume only a little but their stomachs became full due to their repeatedly accepting food, even though it was only a small amount. ...

When the poor man learned that the food was ready, he announced that it was time for the meal. The monks gathered together and sat outside on their seats, only the Buddha sat in the room. The poor man served food skillfully. When the monks only accepted a small quantity of food, the poor man thought, “Do these monks take pity on my poverty and fear that there won’t be enough food? Is this food not good enough for them to eat?” The poor man asked the monks and one shameless monk answered “We feared that there would not be enough food in your house, so we consumed food at other houses before arriving here.”³²²

This rule explicitly states that the reason why the monks ate beforehand, and were thus unable to eat an appropriate amount at the invited house, was because they feared the poor man would have too little for them.

The 32nd rule for Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* gives a different reason than the Pali and the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* for the establishment of this rule. Rather than the donor being a poor man, it is reported that he is a minister in the capital city Rājagaha, and so the fear of there being too little food cannot apply. The story is as follows:

The minister prepared sumptuous food with meat dishes and served the food for the monks, but the monks would not consume very much having previously eaten gruel and solid food made of rice.³²³

The reason why the monks consumed thick gruel in advance of the meal from the minister is that they had attended another meal by invitation, served by lay people in Andhakavinda (阿那頻頭) country. The people of the Andhakavinda had heard that the Buddha allowed the monks to consume gruel, and they prepared and offered that to the monks.³²⁴ In this story, then, it is through accepting two invitations that the

³²² T. XXII. p. 49b. Author’s translation.

³²³ *ibid.* p. 656a. Author’s translation.

³²⁴ *Ibid.*

problem arose, not because the monks were eating in advance to ensure that they did not go hungry.

In the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* a second version of the story of this meal is given. It concerns a musician in Rājagaha who wishes to invite the Buddha and the monks to eat. The land was in the grip of years of famine, but having seen people lavishly offering food to the Buddha and his monks, the musician was eager to do likewise. Even though he prepared various types of delicious food and meat dishes for the monks, they did not eat much. Unlike the concern for the donor's poverty in the Pali and the Mahīśāsaka *vinayas*, here the musician expresses a concern that the monks are refusing the food because they think he does not have sufficient faith in Buddhism.³²⁵ In this version the monks confess that they had eaten before arriving at the musician's house because it was a festival day and other lay people had already offered them food. The musician criticized the monks for this.³²⁶

The two figures who appeared in the 32nd rule of the Expiation (*pācittiya*) section of the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* are not Buddhist followers, though they came to be Buddhists after offering food to the Buddha and the monks. In neither of these stories is there fear of insufficient food, just that the monks have accepted too much food prior to arriving at the donor's house for the arranged meal. Despite this, once their offerings are praised by the Buddha at the end of the meal, the two figures become supporters of Buddhism. What the stories have in common is the lay person who has invited monks for a meal being upset because the monks have no appetite. The rule is therefore aimed at avoiding emotional conflict between the Buddhist Sangha and lay society. The Dharmaguptaka story relates this rule specifically to people who declare their faith in the Buddha after giving food to him and his monks. In other words, the practice of giving food to renouncers is not tradition-specific, but

³²⁵ T. XXII. p. 656c.

³²⁶ *ibid.*

the donors' faith is a consequence of the monks' behaviour, and the donor may have a negative or positive reaction according to whether it is seen as appropriate or not. In the latter cases the rule does not seem to be about controlling craving for food, although in the stories where the monks ate in advance out of fear of receiving insufficient food the element of craving was there.³²⁷

The parallel rule in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, the 31st rule of the Expiation (*pācittiya*) section, provides a similar story to the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*. In this rule, it is an influential minister who invites the Buddha and the monks to a meal. When the monks do not eat much because they have already eaten, the Buddha criticizes the monks and defines the true monk as someone who does not consume food frequently.³²⁸

To sum up, the purpose of the establishment of the 33rd rule requiring Expiation (*pācittiya*) in Pali *vinaya* and its parallels is to avoid disappointing donors. It is also related to the controlling of the craving for food in quantity, as seen in *pācittiya* 33 and 31 of the Pali and the Mahīśāsaka *vinayas* respectively. The Buddha's criticism in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* of monks eating an excessive number of times supports taking this rule to be about preventing monks from acting on the basis of craving for a specific amount of food, i.e. greed for quantity. In the 32nd rule of the Dharmaguptaka school, there is no mention of the rule having the explicit aim of controlling the craving for food. However, it can be said that this rule also is related to the issue of the frequent consuming of food.

“34. In the case of a *bhikkhu* calling at a family residence and being presented with solid food made of rice or cooked grain-meal, he may accept two or three bowlfuls if he so desires. If he accepts more than that, it is to be confessed. Having accepted the

³²⁷ T. XXII. p. 656b.

³²⁸ T. XXIII. P. 88c.

two-or-three bowlfuls and having departed with them, he is to share them amongst other *bhikkhus*. Only this is the proper course of action.”³²⁹

The 34th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Pali *vinaya* says that a monk may take up to two or three bowls of food if lay people offer it, that he should then share the food with his fellow upon his return to the monastery; the other monks should not visit that same lay person on the same day.³³⁰

This rule addresses three issues: one is about the limitation of the food quantity, another is about sharing, and the other is about not bothering the same donor with multiple visits from different monks. A monk should show restraint concerning the quantity of food even though the donor encourages him to take as much as he likes. The third issue is reflected in more detail in the background story to the establishment of the rule in the Pali *vinaya*. When the Buddha was at Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery in Jeta Grove in Sāvattthī, a married daughter, Kāṇā, visits her parental home. Her mother prepares food for the daughter’s husband’s family and they then receive a message from her husband, saying he wants his wife to return. The story continues as follows:

At the same time, a monk visited the mother’s house for alms food. She gave him some of the rice cake she had prepared. Afterwards, he told another monk about it. The second monk visited the house and to him also she gave some of the cake she had made. After he had left, he told a third monk. The third monk visited the house and she gave some of the cake to him as well. All the cake that she had made was given to monks. Kāṇā’s husband sent another messenger asking her to return. Kāṇā’s mother prepared more food, saying it is awkward to go empty-handed, but it disappeared in the same manner as before. Kāṇā’s husband sent a messenger to her a third time, saying ‘I want Kāṇā to return.’ Again Kāṇā’s mother prepared food, again saying, it is

³²⁹ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

³³⁰ Vin. IV. p. 80; Hirakawa 1994: 375-376.

awkward to go empty-handed, but whenever she prepared food, it disappeared. So Kāṇā's husband found another wife.³³¹

In this story, the repeated visits of the monks to the same house coupled with the obligation the mother felt not to refuse them food resulted in the serious consequence of Kāṇā's husband taking a different wife. Presumably these cakes were particularly special and tasty being specially made for the son-in-law. While it is not difficult to conjecture how this happened, we can find explicit explanations in the background stories of other *vinaya*.

The 38th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* is the equivalent to the Pali *pācittiya* 34. By way of background, it provides a conversation between the monks concerned:

After receiving the alms-food, the monk returned to the monastery and shared it with some learned monks. These monks said, "This food is very tasty, where did you get it?" The monk answered, "I received it at the house of the woman with only one eye." On hearing this, the other monks went to the house and took more of the food that the first monk had been given.³³²

This story shows that the monks went to the house of the one-eyed woman (so they were able to identify the specific house) because of their craving for flavoursome food. The monks evaluate the food as 'very tasty (此餅甚好).'

The equivalent rule in the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* is the 34th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*). There the monk who first received the alms food recommends it to other monks:

The woman put various kinds of cakes in the bowl and gave it to the monk. After receiving the food (and returning to the monastery), the monk said to other monks, such and such a house has delicious food and you could receive alms food there. Having heard this, all the monks went to

³³¹ Vin. IV. pp. 78-79. Translation adapted from I B. Horner 1993: 321-322.

³³² T. XXII. p. 360c. Author's translation.

that house to receive alms food. As a result, all the food the woman had prepared was given to the monks and it ran out.³³³

This story states that the monk who initially received the food evaluated it as ‘delicious’ and recommended it to other monks. These two *vinaya* make explicit the motive for the monks to take alms food at the same house: the craving for tasty food. The aim of the rule is to control monks from acting on such cravings.

The Pali *vinaya* provides another background story for this rule. In it there is a layman, about to set out on a journey with a caravan. Just before he leaves, a monk visits him, and the layman gives the monk the food that he was to take with him on this journey. Whenever the lay follower prepared food for his journey, monks would visit him and take it. In the end, he was unable to travel with the caravan and had to undertake the journey alone, and on the way encountered robbers. Having heard this, people criticized the monks as follows:

How is it that these monks, sons of Śākya tribe, do not know moderation in their acceptance (of food)? Having offered the monks the food (for his journey) and set out alone, he was robbed.³³⁴

In this story, people criticize the monks for their lack of moderation, rebuking them for their indulgence. To sum up, the aim of the 34th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Pali *vinaya* is to restrain the monks from repeatedly taking alms food from the same place, a problem which is seen to arise as a result of the craving for food; in most of the background stories it is explicitly the craving for particularly good food.

³³³ T. XXII. p. 51b. Author’s translation.

³³⁴ Vin. IV. p. 80.

“35. Should any *bhikkhu*, having already eaten and having turned down the offer of further food, chew or consume food, staple or non-staple, that is not left over, it is to be confessed.”³³⁵

The 35th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Pali *vinaya* is the regulation in which a monk should not consume staple or non-staple food any more after he eats and is satisfied with food.³³⁶ In other words, a monk, having turned down an offer of further food during a meal provided at the invitation of a lay person, should not consume another meal that day. However, the monk can consume food which has been formally pronounced as ‘Leftover Food’ by other monks.³³⁷ The *Vibhaṅga* does allow a monk, even one who has already eaten enough and has finished eating, to consume food that another monk has declared to be leftovers, whether or not the latter is ill.³³⁸ In order to look at the aim of this rule, we need to look at the story of the establishment of this rule. When the Buddha was staying at Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery in Jeta Grove in Sāvattthī, a Brahmin invited monks for a meal. Having eaten their fill, some monks went to their relatives and families and had more food; others went off with their bowls to gather alms food. When the Brahmin invited his neighbours to come and eat the food, telling them that the monks had had enough, his neighbours questioned this, having seen that the monks had gone off elsewhere for food afterwards. The Brahmin criticized the monks as follows:

“How can the monks, having eaten at my place, go on to eat elsewhere? Is it that I am unable to provide as much as they need?”³³⁹

³³⁵ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from

<http://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

³³⁶ Vin. IV. p. 82. Yo pana bhikkhu bhuttāvī pavārito anatirittam khādaniyam vā bhojaniyam vā khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā pācittiyam.

³³⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 81-82.

³³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 82.

³³⁹ *Ibid.* p. 81. Translation adapted from I B. Horner 1993: 326.

The story behind the equivalent rule in the *Mahīśāsaka vinaya* (also the 35th *pācittiya*) sets the scene during a time of famine. When the Buddha was in Rājagaha, at that time because of a famine it was difficult for the monks to get sufficient alms food in most regions. So they returned to Rājagaha, where laypeople decided to offer them meals. They offered different types of grain to the monks according to their financial resources. Some poor lay people gave beans or barley as they did not have rice. The head of laity had all the food cooked, but the old and ill monks could not consume the food as it was made from coarse grain. They gave the food away to beggars and heretic practitioners, and went to the homes of relatives and ate there instead. The lay people criticised this as follows:

We prepared this meal for the monks by saving up food which our children, wives and we could have eaten, so how can the monks look down on this meal, give it away to beggars and heretic monks, and still crave food? These monks claim that they seek liberation and escape from aging, illness and death, so how can they seek rich and pleasant food? For these monks, being a renouncer entails neither religious practices nor etiquette.³⁴⁰

This version in the *Mahīśāsaka vinaya* describes monks avoiding coarse food and seeking more palatable food, but says that these monks are elderly and ill. However there is another case from the same *Mahīśāsaka vinaya*:

The monk, Banantuo (Upananda, 跋難陀), along with other monks, ate food which the head of the laity had given them. [After the meal] he went to the house of the head in search of palatable and pleasant food (美好食). The head asked him, “Did you not just consume a meal with other monks?” The monk answered, “Even though I ate there, I came here too, for fear that you would lose out on the merit of making an individual offering yourself.”

Hearing this, the head rebuked the monk, “There’s a famine now and the food has run out. That is why we prepared meals together. How is it that, in spite of this, you can look down on that meal and crave more sumptuous and pleasant food?”³⁴¹

³⁴⁰ T. XXII. p. 52b. Author’s translation.

³⁴¹ *ibid.* Author’s translation.

This story explicitly states that the monk acted upon his desire for palatable food in spite of the famine. The monk visits the house of the head of lay people to obtain flavoursome food just after eating the meal he had been invited to eat.

The 33rd Expiation rule of the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*, the equivalent of the 35th in the Pali and Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, provides a variation on this story. As in the previous two *vinaya*, the brahmin invites the monks for a meal, at which they eat their fill. After they have left, the brahmin spots the same monks eating chapati in front of the monastery.

The possibility of monks eating leftovers even after it seemed that they had already eaten their fill is the subject of a humorous episode involving the greedy ‘Group of Six’ Monks already mentioned. Schopen describes how a producer-playwright seeking material for a performance witnesses Chanda, one of the Group of Six, abusing the rule permitting the consumption of leftover food, and uses the episode to make the monks the butt of his humour in the play:

“Once the Venerable Chanda, although he had finished eating his meal ... obtained some particularly nice food ... [He] squatted in front of the Venerable Udāyin while he was still eating his meal, and said: “Might the Venerable Udāyin please consider: I, the bhikṣu named Chanda, after eating my meal, making an end of it, completing it, and being finished, have obtained more food and drink and, since I want to eat it, might you make it surplus (*kṛtātirikta*) and present it to me?” Udāyin, having eaten two or three little bites of it, said: “Since it is made yours, now go away!”³⁴²

The equivalent rule in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* (*pācittiya* 35) mentions at the outset that the Buddha praised eating just ‘a Meal a Day’, a reference to the establishment of the precept to avoid eating at the ‘wrong time’ or after noon, Pali *vikālabhojanā*, which I discussed in Chapter 2 with reference to a number of *suttas*.³⁴³ Both the 35th *pācittiya*

³⁴² Schopen 2007: 222.

³⁴³ T. XXII. p. 660 a-c.

and the rule that we will discuss now, the 37th *pācittiya* in the Pali *vinaya*, relate to the issue of how many times and when a monk may eat.³⁴⁴

“37. Should any *bhikkhu* chew or consume staple or non-staple food at the wrong time, it is to be confessed.”³⁴⁵

The 37th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*) in the Pali *vinaya* is the regulation that it is a *pācittiya* offense when a monk consumes food after midday.³⁴⁶ However, the reason given in the *vinaya* for the establishment of the rule is different from the reason given in the *suttas*.

The Pali *vinaya* relates how the establishment of the 37th *pācittiya* took place when the Buddha was at the squirrels’ feeding place in the Bamboo Grove in Rājagaha. At that time, there was a festival on a mountaintop in Rājagaha. The group of seventeen monks—another set group whose identity we shall discuss below—went to see the festival on the mountaintop. Upon seeing the monks, lay people offered them solid food, which they accepted. The monks returned to the monastery and told the Group of Six Monks. The Six Monks rebuked the seventeen monks for their untimely meal.³⁴⁷

The account in the Pali *vinaya* does not explain why the seventeen monks ate the food despite knowing that it was an offense against the monastic code. We can see a fuller version of this story from the background story of the *pācittiya* 37 in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*. This time the Buddha was in Sāvattthī during a festival. Many

³⁴⁴ I have omitted dealing with the Pali *pācittiya* 36 because it does not have different content from the Pali *pācittiya* 35 rule. The difference between the two is whether or not there is intentional instigation by another monk to make a monk eat again after he has finished eating the portion for the day.

³⁴⁵ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

³⁴⁶ Vin. IV. p. 85.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

people prepared food and went to the park to enjoy the festival. The seventeen monks also went to see the festival. Seeing them, laymen praised their handsome appearance. The story reads as follows:

The lay people offered the seventeen monks alcohol and food and asked, “May you consume [these]?” The monks replied “you always can [consume these], but we cannot.” Nonetheless the seventeen monks took [all the liquor and food]. Consuming [it], they drank themselves into a stupor. After they had drunk it all they returned to the Anāthapiṇḍika’s monastery, shaking their heads and hands, and they mumbled, “Today, we thoroughly enjoyed ourselves; there was benefit and fortune, and there was not sadness or suffering.”³⁴⁸

Here the seventeen monks are described as getting so drunk that they become unconscious. According to Pali *pācittiya* 65, the seventeen monks are young and caused a disturbance looking for food and crying from hunger at night. In response, the Buddha established the regulation prohibiting men under the age of twenty from being ordained as monks.³⁴⁹

The Pali *pācittiya* 85 prohibits monks from entering a village at an improper time. The improper time (*vikāla*) means from midday to dawn the next morning. In the Pali background story to this rule, the Group of Six Monks enter a village and discuss worldly concerns with laymen. Topics discussed include food, drink and alcohol. Due to this, the Group of Six Monks were criticised by lay people.³⁵⁰

The Mahīśāsaka *pācittiya* 83, which is the equivalent to the Pali *pācittiya* 85, also has a story concerning the establishment of the rule. The Group of Six Monks went to a village to take alms food and discussed worldly things with lay people on the high road. Seeing this, other lay people criticised them as follows:

“This is not the place where renunciants chat and discuss. Why don’t [these monks] stay in the forest and protect their sense organs. Other lay people say, “This group of monks does not take

³⁴⁸ T. XXIII. p. 95b. Author’s translation.

³⁴⁹ Vin. IV. pp. 128-130.

³⁵⁰ *ibid.* p. 164.

pleasure in the teaching of the Buddha or respect the monastic rules. While indulging in the pleasures of chattering, they forget that the sun sets.”³⁵¹

The Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* 83, the equivalent to the Pali *pācittiya* 85, has a slightly different story for the establishment of the rule. It reads that a monk, Banantuo (Upananda, 跋難陀) entered a village at the wrong time and gambled with laymen. The laymen, after losing at gambling, criticised the monks for entering their village at an improper time.³⁵² Therefore, this rule has been established.

The Sarvāstivāda *pācittiya* 80, which is the equivalent to the Pali *pācittiya* 85, mentions that a monk, Jialiutuoyi (Kaluludāyin, 迦留陀夷), entered a village to preach to an ill woman. The woman repeatedly prevented him from leaving her home by asking him to continue preaching. The monk continued until sunset. It was nightfall before he could leave. As he was passing the village excrement pit, a robber beheaded and buried him in the excrement pit.

These stories, whilst providing a context for the establishment of the rule about not entering a village at an improper time, i.e. after noon, deal with various kinds of trouble that could befall monks if they associate with lay people in villages late in the day. Alarming stories of monks getting involved in gambling or being murdered are given, but more frequently the stories relate to food, alcohol and wordly matters. From this perspective, this rule is a device to prevent monks from being involved in lay society at times when more social activities such as gambling take place, or when it is dangerous, such as at night. These reasons are similar to those given in the *Laṭṭukikopama Sutta* (MN 66, see chapter 2) in connection with the monk, Udāyin’s account of the problems avoided through rule *pācittiya* 37. Therefore, although not concerned with food *per se*, this rule about preventing monks from meeting laymen at inappropriate times could help to strengthen the function of the

³⁵¹ T. XXII. p. 70a. Author’s translation.

³⁵² *ibid.* p. 692c.

Pali *pācittiya* 37, which lays down that a monk should not consume food at improper time, i.e. after noon. It would seem from the story of Pali *pācittiya* 37, in which the Group of Six Monks criticised the seventeen monks before the establishment of the 37th rule of Expiation (*pācittiya*), that the Buddhist Sangha had a dietary custom in which monks should not consume meals after midday before it became a *vinaya* regulation.

The Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* has two stories related to the establishment of the rule in which a monk should not consume a meal after midday. The first story is about the monks, Nantuo (Nanda, 難陀) and Banantuo (Upananda, 跋難陀), who saw the festival in Rājagaha, consumed food offered by laymen and returned to the monastery late.³⁵³ The second story is about the monk, Jialiutuoyi (迦留陀夷, Kaluludāyin) who during his alms round late at night, frightened a pregnant woman.³⁵⁴ This story reminds us of the narrative of Udāyin in the *Laṭukikopama sutta* (MN 66). The Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* says that it is due to these two occurrences that the prohibition on eating after midday was established.

The story in the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* is very similar to that of the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*. Here, the monk, Jialiutuoyi (迦留陀夷) frightens a pregnant woman while on his alms round at night. The pregnant woman criticizes his behaviour as follows:

Why don't you cut your belly with a knife? In the thick of night, you seek alms food. Other renunciants (*samaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas*, 沙門婆羅門) consume a meal a day and are satisfied with it. Why do you eat without restriction as to the time of day or night?³⁵⁵

The remark of the pregnant woman in this story is interesting in terms of its conformity with lay expectations of renouncer behaviour. The story presents the

³⁵³ T. XXII. p. 662c.

³⁵⁴ *ibid.*

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.* p. 54a. Author's translation.

woman as understanding that taking alms food at night is unusual for renouncers, and suggests that it means that the monk, Jialiutuoyi (迦留陀夷), is dissatisfied, and thus subject to craving for food. Therefore the woman verbally abuses him, saying he should cut out his belly since it is the cause of his unreasonable behaviour as a renouncer. It suggests that there was dietary custom for renouncers which pre-existing groups established before the Buddhist Sangha.

The *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, a classical Hindu customary law text dating from around the 5-2nd century B.C. (see chapter 4 for detail) states, “He should ask for [alms food] only when lay people milk cows [i.e. in the morning].”³⁵⁶ Similarly, the *Manusmṛti* law code, dating from the 2nd century B.C to 2nd century A.D explicitly mentions the number of times it is permissible to go begging, “He should go to take alms food once [a day] only.”³⁵⁷

These practices concerning eating times are also found in the practices of the *dhutaṅga*. Among 13 practices of the *dhutaṅga* in the *Visuddhimagga*, the two practices of the 5th (the one-sessioner’s practice) and 7th (the later-food-refuser’s practice) *dhutaṅga* are related to eating times (see chapter 2).

To sum up, the 35th and the 37th *pācittiya* rules in the Pali *vinaya* are different rules, but they rules are closely related to each other in terms of the religious practice they control. Even though we could say that these rules may have the aim of controlling behaviour that might result from giving in to craving for food, it seems rather that the purpose of these rules is to remove the disturbance and risks caused by frequent alms rounds.

³⁵⁶ BDh.II. 10.18.6.

³⁵⁷ MS. VI.55.a.

“38. Should any *bhikkhu* chew or consume staple or non-staple food that has been stored up, it is to be confessed.”³⁵⁸

Pali *pācittiya* 38 is the regulation that a monk should not store food to eat the next morning, and prohibits consuming leftovers from the night before.³⁵⁹ As we saw in chapter 2, *vinaya* rules against storing food are referred to implicitly in the *Aggañña Sutta* as noted by Collins.³⁶⁰ The avoidance of the production and storage of food allows monks to avoid worldly or *pravṛtti* practices (see chapter 2), and is an important identifying feature of Buddhist monastic life. In the *Aggañña Sutta*, the problems arose when people began storing food longer than seven days. In the Pali *vinaya*, the *nissaggiya pācittiya* 23, prohibits the storage of the five kinds of medicines, or ghee (*sappi*), butter (*navanīta*), oil (*tela*), honey (*madhu*) and molasses (*phāṇita*) for longer than seven days. We can see more about the problems of storing food elsewhere in the Pali *nikāya*. For example, the *Sandaka Sutta* (MN 76) includes storing of food as one of five things that an enlightened monk is incapable of doing:

Sandaka, when a *bhikkhu* is an arahant with taints destroyed ... is completely liberated through final knowledge, he is incapable of transgression in five cases. A *bhikkhu* whose taints are destroyed is incapable of deliberately depriving a living being of life; he is incapable of taking what is not given, that is, of stealing; he is incapable of indulging in sexual intercourse; he is incapable of knowingly speaking falsehood; he is incapable of enjoying sensual pleasures by storing them up as he did formerly in lay life.³⁶¹

This list of five equates to five of the ten precepts for Buddhist monastics, except with the storing up of food taking the place of the rule against eating at the wrong time.

³⁵⁸ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

³⁵⁹ Vin. IV. p. 87.

³⁶⁰ Collins 1993: 326.

³⁶¹ Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 420. In addition to this *sutta*, the storing of food is mentioned in other texts as well: DN. I. p. 6; III. p. 235; AN. IV. p. 370.

Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi mention that, according to the Pali commentary on this *sutta*, the phrase, ‘storing them up,’ refers to “food and pleasurable goods.”³⁶²

These texts connect stored food to sensual pleasure. In other words, storing food is connected with acting on the basis of craving for food both in the *Aggañña Sutta* and elsewhere in explicit statements about how monks should behave.

In the Pali *vinaya* account of the establishment of *pācittiya* 38, a monk, Belaṭṭhasīsa, dries some of the food left over after eating the meal he had received on his alms round. The next day, he does not go on the alms round but eats the dried food after rehydrating it. His not going on his alms round leaves the other monks wondering how he survives. Venerable Belaṭṭhasīsa explains that he stores his food and this is the reason for establishing the rule.³⁶³

In the story in the Pali *vinaya* it seems that the reason why Belaṭṭhasīsa stores his food is to avoid the inconvenience of the daily alms round. This is made more explicit in the parallel rule in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, (also *pācittiya* 38). There, the monk, Jialuo (迦羅) thinks, “Why do I go on the alms round daily even though it is tiring? ”, “Why don’t I eat this alms food first, then get more to take home [for the following day]?” So he does this but other monks worry when they do not see him. When they see him the following morning, they ask him what had happened to him the day before. Venerable Jialuo explains what he had done, and this becomes the reason for establishing the rule.³⁶⁴ This fuller story in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* identifies the reason for storing food as avoiding the tiredness caused by repeated alms rounds.

The Mahīśāsaka *pācittiya* 39, the equivalent of Pali *pācittiya* 38, gives a second reason against storing food. Its story relates that there was a temple in Rājagaha

³⁶² Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 1283, note 756.

³⁶³ Vin. IV. pp. 86-87.

³⁶⁴ T. XXII. pp. 662c-663a.

where performances were being held. A large number of people gather to see the performances, bringing with them delicious food. There was so much of it that the monks obtained more than they could eat. They took a lot and returned home with what was left over after eating their meal. They stored food in every corner of their residence. As time passed, maggots appeared in the food and rats broke through the walls to get at it. The story continues as follows:

Seeing this, laymen asked, “Who stored this food?” People replied, “Śākyan monks stored it.” So the laymen criticised, “This group of the shaven intentionally and greedily accepted food, and are not concerned with wasting (it). This is not the appropriate behaviour for monks: it goes against the etiquette of renouncers.”³⁶⁵

The stories for this rule give two types of motivation for monks storing food: one is the desire to avoid the inconvenience of repeatedly going for alms; the other is greed. The avoidance of repeated alms rounds might be not just about inconvenience but also about anxiety as to whether or not they would succeed in procuring food on the next alms round. If so they want to take it while there is plenty. This fits with the last story, where they stored the food, but did not eat it immediately, allowing it to go rotten and attract flies and rats.

Other narratives in the canon tell of occasions when monks, and even the Buddha, found it difficult to obtain alms food. The *Ekottara Āgama* tells of monks being unable to obtain food at a village of Brahmins.³⁶⁶ Although this text states that monks’ failure to obtain alms food was contrived by the ‘evil one’ (*māra*), the story could be indicative of antagonism between Buddhist renouncers and Brahmins. According to a story in the *Samyukta Āgama*, the Buddha, too, experienced difficulty in obtaining food

³⁶⁵ T. XXII. p. 54b. Author’s translation.

³⁶⁶ T. II. p. 772b.

at a Brahmin village.³⁶⁷ The Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* also relates a story about nuns not being able to procure food due to famine.³⁶⁸

“39. These are the finer staple foods: ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk, and curds. Should any *bhikkhu* who is not ill having request finer staple foods such as these for his own sake and then consume them, it is to be confessed.”³⁶⁹

Pali *pācittiya* 39 is the regulation that a monk should not request and consume luxury food items for his own use. This rule mentions nine sumptuous foodstuffs which a monk is prohibited from requesting for himself and consuming unless he is ill. In order to look at the reason behind this prohibition, we shall turn to the story of the establishment of this rule in Pali *vinaya*:

In Sāvattihī, the group of six monks asked for and consumed sumptuous food. Then, laymen rebuked them for indulging in luxury foodstuffs, saying, “How do monks ask for sumptuous food items for themselves and eat them?” “Who does not enjoy them? Who does not like palatable [food]?”³⁷⁰

Whatever are sumptuous foods, or, ghee (*sappi*), butter (*navanīta*), oil (*tela*), honey (*madhu*), molasses (*phāṇita*), fish (*maccha*), meat (*maṃsa*), milk (*khīra*), and curd (*dadhi*), if a monk consumes these foodstuffs when they are not ill, that is the violation of Expiation (*pācittiya*).³⁷¹

The notorious Group of Six Monks pops up throughout the *vinaya* in order to exemplify what monks should not do. Everything they do tends to be in some way outrageous or inappropriate, usually by virtue of being self-serving, and they appear in the background stories to the establishment of a number of rules that exist to

³⁶⁷ T. II. p. 288a.

³⁶⁸ T. XXII. p. 86b.

³⁶⁹ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstosinsight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part4> on 20/6/2015.

³⁷⁰ Vin. IV. p. 71. Kassa sampannaṃ na manāpam, kassa sādum na ruccatīti. Translation adapted from, I B. Horner 1993: 341.

³⁷¹ Ibid. Translation adapted from I B. Horner 1993: 341.

ensure reasonable, unselfish behaviour on the part of monks that will avoid offending lay people. Gregory Schopen has pointed out that the Group of Six tends to be well-versed in both *vinaya* and in the doctrinal sayings of the Buddha. They are shown repeatedly using such knowledge to their advantage, particularly where it comes to grabbing the best lodgings for themselves or being able to indulge in their fondness for fine food. He points out that in this latter respect they form a comic role much like that of the *vidūṣaka* or ‘buffoon’ in classical Indian drama.³⁷² Within the Group of Six Monks, Schopen, studying them on the basis of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*, points out two that have quite strongly sketched characters. Upananda is particularly interested in food, while Udāyin is also interested in women. By using this group of notoriously self-serving monks to illustrate this rule, the *vinaya* counters the craving for food simply by prohibiting monks from seeking out offerings of the sumptuous foods that people tend to crave.

The *vinaya* of other Buddhist schools also mention various palatable foodstuffs. Table 3.4 compares the sumptuous items listed in the five major Buddhist *vinaya* for which we have most evidence.³⁷³ While there is significant overlap, there are some differences in the number of items and the order in which they are listed. The Pali *vinaya* has the longest list.

Pāli	Dharmaguptaka	Mahīśāsaka	Mahāsāṃghika	Sarvāstivāda
1. milk (<i>khīra</i>)	milk (油)	milk (油)	milk (油)	milk (油)
2. curd (<i>dadhi</i>)	curd (酪)	curd (酪)	curd (酪)	curd (酪)
3. fish (<i>maccha</i>)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)	fish (魚)
4. meat (<i>maṃsa</i>)	meat (肉) ³⁷⁴	meat (肉)	meat (肉)	meat (肉)

³⁷² Schopen 2007: 208.

³⁷³ On Buddhist cosmology in relation to these food items, see Ch.1 and also Collins 1993: 326.

³⁷⁴ T. XXII. p. 664b.

5. ghee (<i>sappi</i>)		ghee (酥)	ghee (酥)	Ghee (熟酥)
6. oil (<i>tela</i>)		oil (油) ³⁷⁵	oil (油)	oil (油)
7. honey (<i>madhu</i>)			honey (蜜)	Butter (生酥)
8. molasses (<i>phāṇita</i>)			molasses (石蜜) ³⁷⁶	Jerky (脯) ³⁷⁷
9. butter (<i>navanīta</i>) ³⁷⁸				

Table 3.4. Sumptuous food items which are defined in the five major Buddhist *vinayas*.³⁷⁹

Comparing the background story to the establishment of this rule in the Pali *Vibhaṅga* with the equivalent passages from other Buddhist schools reveals more details. This is the story for the establishment of the 39th rule in the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*, which is the equivalent to the 39th rule in Pali *vinaya*:

In Sāvattihī, the Group of Six Monks requested and received alms food from lay people as follows: they took ghee from the house where there was ghee; oil from the house where there was oil; milk from the house where there was milk; curd from the house where there was curd; honey from the house where there was honey; molasses from the house where there was molasses; fish from the house where there was fish; and meat from the house where there was meat. Some lay people rebuked the Group of the Six Monks for this behaviour, saying, the Buddha in various ways praises monks who are easily satisfied with little desire, who do not hesitate to undergo hardship in maintaining and satisfying the body with food, but these monks hate to receive coarse food.³⁸⁰

In this story, the lay people accuse the Group of Six Monks of making a mockery of the teaching of the Buddha and ask themselves whether the Group of Six Monks have any

³⁷⁵ T. XXII. p. 55b.

³⁷⁶ *ibid.* p. 361c.

³⁷⁷ T. XXIII. p. 97a.

³⁷⁸ V. IV. p. 88.

³⁷⁹ The order of the sumptuous food items in the *vinayas* changed for the convenience of comparison.

³⁸⁰ T. XXII. p. 361c.

religious ideals.³⁸¹ This shows that the laity regards indulgence in the flavour of food as signifying a serious disqualification from the status of being a religious practitioner.

Rebuking the behaviour of the six monks, the Buddha describes it as an ‘unwholesome action’ and invokes the standard formula of disapprobation found in the *vinaya* to show that the Buddha is banning a particular behaviour.³⁸² He says that their action was wrong and their behavior is not ‘right *dhamma*’, ‘right *vinaya*’, or ‘the teaching of the Buddha.’ The Buddha further states this behaviour would prevent them from cultivating ‘wholesomeness.’³⁸³ Here, the Buddha expresses his opinion that the behaviour whereby monks seek out and indulge in flavoursome food is not virtuous and is not acceptable in respect of Buddhist teaching and practice.

When their request for flavorsome food is not satisfied in the *Mahīsāsaka pācittiya* 41, the Group of Six Monks are openly angry and aggressively rude to the lay people offering them food:

When the Buddha was in Rājagaha, some lay people came to a monastery and asked the monks how many monks were at the monastery. The monks answered that there were such and such a number of monk here. The lay people said to the monks, “We would like to invite you tomorrow. Please come and accept a meal from us even though it will be simple food.” The Group of Six Monks said to the lay people, “If you treat us with milk, curd, ghee, oil, fish and meat, we will accept your offering.” The lay people answered that in order to prepare those foods they would purchase them at market even if they had to borrow money to do so. After giving this answer, they returned home. They tried to borrow money, but they could not and they tried to purchase those foodstuffs, but they could not.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*

³⁸² The term, ‘bad action (惡事)’ is frequently mentioned by the Buddha and in Buddhist texts. This means criminal actions, inappropriate actions as monks or bad actions for achieving religious ideals: e.g. T. XXII. p. 4a; T. XXII. p. 324c; T. XXII. p. 361c.

³⁸³ *Ibid.* p. 361c.

The next day, having prepared food, the lay people informed the monastery that the meal was ready to be served. After putting on their outer robes and collecting their bowls, the monks came and took their places at the houses of the lay people.

When water and food was served, the Group of Six Monks reprimanded the laymen for not preparing dishes containing milk, curd, ghee, oil, fish and meat. The lay people answered that they had tried to borrow money, and had tried to purchase those foodstuffs, but they could not. The Group of Six Monks turned their bowls over and went away.

The lay people told others about this, that the monks, when they had not obtained sumptuous food, turned over their bowls and left. 'Are they kings or ministers?' 'The religious practitioners, who renounce family life, should pursue liberation and be content with alms food, but they are attached to the flavour of food.' 'They did not practise the virtues of religious practitioners and abandoned the path for religious practitioners.'³⁸⁴

This story shows that monks demanding the luxury foodstuffs could cause an excessive financial burden to lay people, besides indicating their own moral and meditative failure. Since the affronted lay people question whether the monks are kings or ministers, we may take it that it is only such privileged, powerful people who can expect such luxury foodstuffs in their everyday diet. These foods were not common, daily food items for the populace, and so they should be used sparingly and only requested when a monk urgently needs them for a medical reason.

This story about the indignation of the lay people at the Group of Six Monk's fastidiousness or self-indulgence in relation to food suggests that there was a shared understanding between religious practitioners and the laity about the appropriate expectations of mendicants. It seems that this understanding lies behind the establishment of the rule that Buddhist monks and nuns should not seek out and ask for sumptuous food. So although the Buddha, unlike some renouncer groups, did not rate the avoidance of food as indicative of progress in renunciation (see chapter 2), the expectations lay people had of renouncer behaviour from that broader cultural

³⁸⁴ T. XXII. p. 55a-b.

context informed how monks should eat: both free from craving and in accordance with lay people's expectations of modesty. Here we have examined the Pali and the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*. The other three *vinaya* listed in the table above, the Sarvāstivāda,³⁸⁵ the Dharmaguptaka³⁸⁶ and the Mūlasarvāstivāda rules,³⁸⁷ contain similar passages in relation to luxury foodstuffs, with a great degree of overlap as to what constitutes luxury food. In Buddhist *vinaya*, monks may consume sumptuous foodstuffs when they are offered by lay people, but it is prohibited that a monk specifically asks laymen to offer luxury foodstuffs for his own consumption. All of the Buddhist *vinaya* texts related to this rule prohibiting luxury foodstuffs consider that the most significant point in this Expiation (*pācittiya*) rule is whether or not monks indulge in the flavour of food, as is indicated by their seeking it out when it is not needed for medical reasons. It is problematic not just because it is inappropriate for monks to do, but because its inappropriateness would cause affront to lay people, who are shown as having informed expectations of appropriate renouncer attitudes to food. The fact that monks sometimes consume luxury food is not in itself the issue.³⁸⁸

“40. Should any *bhikkhu* take into his mouth anything edible that has not been given to him, it is, except for water and tooth-cleaning sticks, to be confessed.”³⁸⁹

Pali *pācittiya* 40 is the regulation that a monk should not take into his mouth a consumable item which has not been given to him by someone else except for water or a wooden stick for brushing the teeth.³⁹⁰ The story behind the rule is set at the

³⁸⁵ T. XXIII. p. 97a.

³⁸⁶ T. XXII. p. 664b.

³⁸⁷ T. XXIII. p. 828a.

³⁸⁸ Vin. IV. p. 88.

³⁸⁹ Translation adapted from Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc> on 18/5/2014.

³⁹⁰ Vin. IV. p. 90.

Gabled Roof of the Great Grove in Vesāli. There was a monk who lived in a cemetery. Wearing clothes made of rags, he did not accept gifts given from people, but ate the food left for dead ancestors, which was left in a cemetery, or under a tree, or on the threshold of houses. People accuse him of consuming the food left out for their ancestors. Later, they conclude that the reason why the monk was so strong and fat was because he ate the bodies of their ancestors. The lay people were outraged, and in response the Buddha established the rule.³⁹¹

In the *Bhesajjakhandha* the Pali *vinaya* has a case in which a monk does eat human flesh. The story relates that the monk ate flesh from the thigh of a lay women to cure his illness.³⁹² This story is the foundation story of the prohibition of eating human flesh, which is one of the ten prohibited meats in Pali Buddhism. Eating human flesh is considered to be a more serious infraction than eating any other prohibited meat (see chapter 5). It seems in this case that the reason why the monk ate human flesh was to cure his illness following a medical remedy of the time.

Two other cases related to human flesh occur in *Jātaka* stories. Here the prince *mahāsattva* offers his own flesh to a starving tigress, and king Sivi provides a hawk with flesh from his thigh to save the life of a dove.³⁹³ In these two stories, the protagonists sacrifice themselves to save the lives of others, this being the *bodhisattva*'s means to achieve perfection (*pāramī*).

Various Mahāyāna texts mention the *dāna* of one's body. The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Sūtra* also mentions the gift of flesh, body parts and organs to others for the same reason as shown in the *jātaka*. In general, human flesh is mainly related to sacrifice to save others which is in turn related to achieving religious

³⁹¹ Vin. IV. pp. 89-90.

³⁹² Vin. I. pp. 216-218.

³⁹³ Grey 1994: 222. The *Sivi Jātaka* 499 mentions only the story in which the one eye of King Sivi is donated to a blind man, but paintings of the *Sivi Jātaka* show the donations of eye, body parts and flesh to others.

virtue. The exception is the case in the *Bhesajjakhandha* in which human flesh is consumed for medical reasons.

However, in Hinduism, there is an extreme religious practice in which human flesh is consumed to achieve their religious ideals. The lay people in the foundation story of the Pali *pācittiya* 40 conjecture that when they saw the Buddhist monk who performed his cemetery practice and looked ruddy and fat, the monk had been eating the flesh of their ancestors. This assumption presupposes the existence of ascetics who perform religious practice in which human flesh is consumed. Even though the period of the establishment of the *Aghori* Śaiva sect postdates the period of formation of the Buddhist *vinaya*, the *Kāpālikas* and the *Lākulas* as the predecessors of the Śaivite *Aghori* are mentioned in Hala's *Sattasāi* which is datable to the 3-5th century C. E.³⁹⁴

The background story to *pācittiya* 39 in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, the equivalent of the Pali *vinaya* 40, sets the occasion for this rule in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery in Jeta Grove in Sāvattthī. There, a monk decided to live as a Buddhist ascetic, taking alms food and wearing the clothes made of rags. Around that time, lay people in Sāvattthī would put food for their dead parents, siblings and husbands down at crossroads, on the thresholds of houses, on the banks of streams, under trees, beside stones and in shrines. Once the lay people had performed their rituals and offered the food for the dead, the monk would take the food for himself and eat it. When they saw this, the lay people hated him and criticised him as follows:

A renunciant Śākya son knows no shame and violates the precept against taking what is not given. Even though he says that he practises the right path publicly, where is the right path? We prepared food, performed rituals and offered the food for our dead parents and siblings, but [the monk] took and ate the food. He behaves as if we put food down here to offer the food to the

³⁹⁴ Lorenzen 1972: 13.

monk. We put this food down and performed the ritual for our dead parents and siblings, but [the monk] took and ate the food.³⁹⁵

The foundation stories of the Pali *pācittiya* 40 and the Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* 39 mentioned above show the outrage of laity at monks eating food which is put out for their ancestors. Indian society had the tradition to worship ancestors from Vedic times and this comprises of one of the five daily responsibilities for a householder. This is called the *pañca-mahāyajña* : 1) sacrifice to the gods (*devayajña*), 2) sacrifice to the ancestors (*pitryajña*), 3) sacrifice to beings (*bhūtajajña*), 4) sacrifice to men (*manuṣyayajña*), and 5) sacrifice to the Veda (*brahmayajña*).³⁹⁶ The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* explains these rituals as follows:

The great sacrifices are five; they are spread out daily; they are accomplished daily: the sacrifice to the gods, the sacrifice to the ancestors, the sacrifice to beings, the sacrifice to men, and the sacrifice to the Veda. When one merely offers a piece of wood into the fire, he accomplished a sacrifice (to the gods). When one performs *svadhā* for the ancestors, even water, he accomplishes a sacrifice to the ancestors. When he offers an oblation to the *bhūtas*, he accomplishes the sacrifice to the beings. When he gives food to Brahmins, he accomplishes a sacrifice to men. When he learns the recitation of the Veda, even one *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman*, he accomplishes a sacrifice to the Veda.³⁹⁷

In later *Gṛhyasūtras* period, ancestral worship is replaced by the form of *śrāddha*-rite. The *śrāddha*-rite has four forms:

- A. *Pārvaṇa śrāddha* rite (new moon *śrāddha* rite): regular monthly ancestor worship focused on the offering of *piṇḍas* to the Ancestors and modelled, broadly on the *piṇḍapitryajña*
- B. *Ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha* rite (*śrāddha* rite directed to one person): sustains the deceased father in the first year after his death, between the states of living father and Ancestor, that is, as a ghost.

³⁹⁵ T. XXII. p. 663c.

³⁹⁶ Translation of these five sacrifices, Sayers 2008: 38.

³⁹⁷ TĀ. 2.10.1. Translation adapted from Sayers 2008: 39.

C. *Sapiṇḍikaraṇa śrāddha* rite (*śrāddha* rite that creates the bond of kinship): the deceased man's son promotes his father from this liminal state to the position of Ancestor.

D. *Ābhyudāyika śrāddha* rite (the prosperity *śrāddha* rite): A householder performs this rite on any auspicious occasion, such as a wedding or the birth of a son, to invoke the positive, beneficial aspect of the ancestors.³⁹⁸

The main purpose of this *śrāddha* rite for the ancestors is to feed the ancestors.³⁹⁹ This *śrāddha* rite is not only for deceased father or ancestors, but also for the merit of the descendants who offer food to their ancestor. Matthew R. Sayers, an Indologist, mentions that Buddhist texts such as the *Jāṇussoṇi Sutta* in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and the *Petavatthu* show the influence of *śrāddha* rites.⁴⁰⁰ The “Ghosts outside the Walls (*tirokuḍḍapetavatthu*)”⁴⁰¹ in the *Petavatthu* shows a Buddhist reflection on *śrāddha* rite in detail:

14. They stand outside the walls and at the junctions and crossroads; they stand at the door posts, returned to their own house.

15. (Even) when plentiful food and drink, foods both hard and soft, are served, no one remembered those being because of their actions. ...

17. “Let this be for our relatives! Let our relatives be happy!” They assembled there, and those assembled ghost-relatives respectfully rejoiced over the plentiful food and drink (saying).

18. “Long live our relatives, by whom we have acquired (this). We have been revered, and the donors are not without fruit.” ...

23. Certainly no weeping, sorrow, or any other lamentation is to the benefit of the departed (though their) relatives continue in this way.

24. But this donation, firmly established in the Sangha, will immediately serve to benefit them for a long time.

³⁹⁸ Translation adapted from Sayers 2013: 71.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid*: 71.

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid*: 91.

⁴⁰¹ *Ibid*: 94

25. Now, this duty to one's relatives has been declared and the ghosts have been revered excellently; and strength has been dedicated to the monks and the merit you produced was no little bit.⁴⁰²

As we have seen in the Pali *pācittiya* 40 and the Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* 39, the *Petavatthu* also mentions the places the ghosts of the deceased frequently haunt and the descents put food for their ancestors, such as walls and junctions, crossroads, and the door posts of houses. As we have seen in verses 17-18 above, the relationship between descents and the deceased ancestors is not unilateral but bilateral. The ancestors receive food and respect and rejoice in happiness, on the other hand the descendents are wished longevity by their ancestors. Generally, the benefit of Vedic sacrifices is enumerated as “long life, worldly wealth, prosperity, sons, protection, success and so on.”⁴⁰³ Even though the *Petavatthu* mentions only longevity for descendents, the Brahmanical texts for the *śrāddha* rite enumerate “the triad of food, clothing and housing,”⁴⁰⁴ and these three factors of benefit are bilateral between the ancestors and the descendents.⁴⁰⁵

In the *Jāṇussoṇi Sutta* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha explains the efficacy of performing the *śrāddha* rite (*saddha* in Pali) to a brahmin, *Jāṇussoṇi*. The Buddha in this *sutta* explains the *śrāddha* rite, but the content of the rite is not the same as that of the brahmanic texts. The Buddha emphasizes ethical behavior based on the ten wholesome actions, which determine one's posthumous destination, and generous offerings to ancestors, which guarantee food after death.⁴⁰⁶ The Buddha explains that the recipients of offerings are the *samaṇa brāhmaṇa*,⁴⁰⁷ but as we have seen in verses 24 and 25 above, the *Petavatthu* remarks that the best recipient of offerings is the

⁴⁰² Pv. 1.5.14-25. Translation Sayers 2013: 94-95.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid*: 3.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid*: 99.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid*.

⁴⁰⁶ AN. V. p. 271.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid*.

Buddhist Sangha. In the *Jāṇussoṇi Sutta* offering is considered to be the same as performing *śrāddha* rites.⁴⁰⁸

The Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* 39 mentioned earlier shows the conflict between the belief concerning ancestor worship and the action of monks who eat food for the ancestors. The food, which is offered at crossroads, doors of houses, banks of streams, under trees, besides stones and shrines, is not food which can be used by monks but food which should be used by the ancestors of donors. This food is not only related to the welfare of their ancestors, but also to their own longevity, wealth and so on. Therefore, that laity were outraged at the behaviour of monks is not strange given these beliefs and it is natural that they considered the behaviour of the monks as theft.

The story of the establishment of the Mahīśāsaka *pācittiya* 37, equivalent to the Pali *pācittiya* 40, indicates serious potential conflict between monks and lay people. When the Buddha was in Rājagaha, the monks entered the houses of the people they knew and ate food that had not been given to them. The lay people rebuked the monks for this behaviour:

We are not pleased to see these evil-doers wearing torn and grey-coloured clothes⁴⁰⁹ and consuming food that wasn't given to them. To eat what is not given is a theft.⁴¹⁰

In this story, the lay people explicitly condemn the behaviour as theft. The Mahīśāsaka *pācittiya* 37 also has a story about the monk Mahākassapa. He wore ragged clothes and picked up and ate the food which was discarded on the street. As we saw

⁴⁰⁸ An. V. p. 269, cited Sayers 2013: 93.

⁴⁰⁹ The grey-coloured clothes signifies the outer robe (*kaṣāya*) for monks. This robe is made with torn cloth and avoids the five cardinal colours such as blue, yellow, red, white and black. The Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* says that the grey-colour means blue, black and the colour of tree bark (T. XL. p.86b). The robe is intentionally made to not look good. The purpose of making the clothes look ugly is to remove the desire for clothes. *Fo Kwang Dictionary*. p. 4784. Author's translation.

⁴¹⁰ T. XXII. p. 53a. Author's translation.

in chapter 2, in ancient India this was for renouncers a legitimate form of food gathering.⁴¹¹ However, at the sight of this lay people criticised him:

This renunciant is like a dog. [He] takes and eats the food which is unclean and loathsome.

How can we accept him into our houses?⁴¹²

Mahākassapa is a well-known Buddhist ascetic practitioner, and this is a method of obtaining food called gathering ‘discarded food.’⁴¹³ Olivelle explains various kinds of methods of obtaining food used by renouncers.

Firstly he mentions four kinds of methods:

- A. *Kuṭīcaka* (the lowest class): this begging is nominal. He begs, or, more accurately, eats at the house of his son or relative.
- B. *Bahūdaka* : he begs his food from seven houses.
- C. *Haṃsa*: this method is associated not with a distinct style of begging but with specific forms of fasting.
- D. *Mādhukara* (the bee-method): he begs randomly just a morsel each from many houses, just as a bee gathers nectar.

Secondly, there are two kinds of methods:

- A. *Turīyātīta*: this practice is also called *govrata* (cow-vow). In this practice, the ascetic imitates a cow and eats the food directly from the ground using only his mouth.
- B. *Avadhūta*: this practice is associated with the *ajagaravṛtti* (the python’s lifestyle). In this practice, the ascetic does not actively seek food but passively

⁴¹¹ T. XXII. p. 357a.

⁴¹² *Ibid.* p. 53a. Author’s translation.

⁴¹³ For ascetic practices for food, See. Olivelle 1987: 23-26.

waits for someone to give him food without being asked, just as a python lies in wait for his prey to come to it.

Thirdly, there are two kinds of method which overlap with the above classes:

A. *Pāṇipātra*: this practice does not use a begging bowl but alms-food is received into one's hands and it is eaten immediately upon receiving it.

B. *Udarapātra*: this practice does not even use his hands and eats with his mouth directly from the ground. This seems to be the same as the *govrata*.⁴¹⁴

The Buddha points out that even though a monk does not have a craving for food, people could feel that such acts are repulsive and not clean. Because it is unacceptable to laypeople, the Buddha therefore prohibits monks from picking up and eating food which has been discarded. Merely consuming discarded food is classed as the lesser offence of 'Wrongdoing (*dukkata*, 突吉羅)'.⁴¹⁵

According to the Sarvāstivāda *pācittiya* 39, equivalent to the Pali *pācittiya* 40, it seems that living on discarded items was nonetheless allowed in the Buddhist Sangha. This text explains that the monk who accepts this way of life lives on discarded items, in other words, on discarded food, discarded clothes, discarded bowls, discarded walking sticks and discarded leather shoes:

Mo he jia luo (摩訶迦羅) was a monk who accepted the ascetic practice of living on discarded items. He was strong and plump and looked well. Once, as the monk tried to go on an alms round, a gatekeeper thought, "while there was an epidemic spreading, this monk did not go on the alms round, but now that there is no epidemic, he has entered this castle. He is strong and plump and looks well. He must have eaten human flesh." This rumour then spread around Sāvattihī. Because of this episode, this rule was established.⁴¹⁶

⁴¹⁴ Olivelle 1991: 23-24.

⁴¹⁵ T. XXII. p. 53a. Translation adapted from Olivelle.

⁴¹⁶ T. XXIII. p. 96a.

The Mahāsāṃghika *pācittiya* 35, the equivalent to Pali *pācittiya* 40, also provides a story for the establishment of this rule. When a monk, Analu (阿那律) entered Sāvattthī he saw a woman carrying a box on her hip containing rice, grass, cow dung and ritual implements. Analu went up and down the streets seeking alms but received nothing. He went to the lakeside and saw the woman again. After the woman had sprinkled water on the ground and cleaned up it, laid out grasses and put down the ritual implements, she performed some rituals. She then scattered rice on every side and said, “Come, wise birds and eat, come, wise birds and eat.” While this was happening, Analu was standing under a tree, and because of his supernatural powers, the birds would not eat the rice. The woman then criticised him and left, saying “You are always following people like a one-eyed bird.”⁴¹⁷

It seems that this woman was performing one of the five offerings (*pañcamahāyajña*), the offering to beings (*bhūtayajña*), which is considered as a daily duty for a householder in ancient India. In this practice, the proper recipients of the offering of rice are animals, in this case birds. That was the reason why the woman was irritated the monk. The brahmanic *pañcamahāyajña* are equivalent to the Five Offering (*pañcabali*) in Pali Buddhist texts, but the content of the five items is slightly different each from the other.

The Five Offerings (<i>pañcabali</i>)	The Five Offerings (<i>pañcamahāyajña</i>)
1. the offering to relatives	1. the offering to gods
2. to guests	2 to ancestor
3. to the previously deceased	3. to beings
4. to king	4. to men
5. to the gods ⁴¹⁸	5. to the Veda ⁴¹⁹

⁴¹⁷ T. XXII. p. 357a. Author’s translation.

⁴¹⁸ AN. II. pp. 187-188. Translation Sayers 2008: 87.

⁴¹⁹ TĀ . 2.10.1 Translation Sayers 2008: 38.

Table 3.5. The difference between the Five Offerings in Buddhist texts (*pañcabali*;) and Brahmanic texts (*pañcamahāyajña*).

The Mahāsāṃghika *pācittiya* 35 and the Sarvāstivāda *pācittiya* 39 both explain the ascetic practices in obtaining food, but they define discarded food differently. The Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* defines radish leaves (蘿蔔葉), coriander (胡荽葉) and basil (羅勒葉) which have been offered to the dead, and are abandoned as ‘discarded food (糞掃食)’ and monks can clean them in water and eat them.⁴²⁰ The Mahāsāṃghika *pācittiya* 35, says that discarded food is food for the spirits (鬼神) which has been offered at a shrine.⁴²¹

The reason why these two texts explain the ascetic practice of living on items discarded by others is that certain types of ascetic practices that existed at the time led to the problems outlined here. As a result, this *pācittiya* rule was established to make clear what is and is not permissible for monks who take on ascetic practices in relation to eating.

The monks, who are mentioned in the two *vinayas* above, are the Buddhist ascetic practitioners, Anuruddha (阿那律) in the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* and Mahākāla (摩訶迦羅) in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, and they lived on food discarded by others. The *vinaya* texts explicitly explain that these foods are discarded.

To sum up, the foundation story mentioned in Pali *pācittiya* 40 shows that lay followers could misunderstand the monk living on food in the charnel-ground because there were extreme ascetics like Śaiva cemetery practitioners who ate dead bodies. The background story of the Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* 39 also shows that the behaviour of a monk eating food which is dedicated to the ancestors could conflict

⁴²⁰ T. XXIII. p. 96a.

⁴²¹ T. XXII. p. 357a.

with lay society because it has a traditional and strong belief of ancient Indian ancestor worship.

The foundation story of the Mahīśāsaka *pācittiya* 37 introduces the story in which a monk eats food without permission and which is not given, and the second story of the Mahīśāsaka *pācittiya* 37 relates the story of a monk who lives on discarded food on the street. These four stories are generally against the belief of ancestor worship at that time and the Buddhist Sangha must have intended avoiding conflict situations with lay society.

3-3. The rule prohibiting alcohol (Pali *pācittiya* 51)

“51. The drinking of alcohol or fermented liquor is to be confessed.”⁴²²

Pali *pācittiya* 51 is the regulation that a monk should drink neither grain liquor nor fruit liquor.⁴²³ Before dealing with this rule, let us briefly look at how alcohol is seen in Buddhist texts. Drinking alcohol is prohibited as one of the five precepts.⁴²⁴ The five precepts are often considered as the most significant ethical standards for

⁴²² Translation Thanissaro. Accessed from <http://www.accesstosight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc-part6> on 27/7/2015.

⁴²³ Vin. IV. p. 110. *Surāmerayapāne pācittiyaṃ*.

⁴²⁴ The Ten Precepts also include drink alcohol. The Ten Precepts are as follows:

1. Refrain from killing living beings
2. Refrain from stealing
3. Refrain from sexual misconduct
4. Refrain from false speech
5. Refrain from drinking intoxicants
6. Refrain from consuming food at inappropriate times
7. Refrain from singing, dancing, playing music or attending performances
8. Refrain from wearing perfume, cosmetics and garland
9. Refrain from sitting on high chairs and sleeping on luxurious beds
10. Refrain from accepting money.

Buddhists. They also prohibit killing, stealing, sexual misconduct and lying. The precept identifies alcohol as causing loss of mindfulness or attentiveness. Given the teaching that the quality of mind is the precursor to a person's ethical or unethical behaviour, mindfulness is an attribute highly prized in Buddhist teachings, crucial in realisation of the path. A more serious consequence of drinking alcohol is that it also causes social problems such as, quarreling, stealing, violence and killing. The Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* declares that drinking alcohol causes and exacerbates conflict.⁴²⁵

The *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* (*Abhidharmayāyānusāra śāstra*, 阿毘達磨順正理論) defines the nature of drinking alcohol as follows:

Drinking alcohol causes the mind to be self-indulgent and makes us unable to abide by moral law. ... The Buddha therefore knows that drinking alcohol causes us to commit sins, damages right mindfulness and right wisdom, causes the violation of precepts and the loss of right view and leads to ignorance. Drinking alcohol is therefore one of the things which he said Buddhists should learn not to commit.⁴²⁶

This text considers drinking alcohol as a possible cause for all sins. It further mentions that drinking alcohol causes mental defilements to be extreme.⁴²⁷ The *Dirgha Āgama* (*Changahan jing*, 長阿含經) describes the Buddha as a being who has discarded and is now detached from the drinking of alcohol.⁴²⁸ Therefore, the Buddha demands that “From now on those who take me as their teacher must not even take the tip of a blade of grass and drip wine into their mouths.”⁴²⁹

Commonly in Buddhist texts, drinking alcohol is mentioned in connection with lust. The *Ekottara Āgama* (*Zengyiahhan jing*, 增一阿含經) says that people who indulge in

⁴²⁵ T. XXII. p. 1005c; p. 1012a.

⁴²⁶ T. XXIX. p. 560b.

⁴²⁷ Ibid. p. 638c.

⁴²⁸ T. I. p. 89a.

⁴²⁹ Benn 2005: 232.

alcohol and lust have no shame and experience no satisfaction.⁴³⁰ Drinking alcohol is frequently connected to self-indulgence in Buddhist texts. The *Madhyama Āgama* (*Zhonggahan jing*, 中阿含經) states that individuals who indulge in alcohol and self-indulgence suffer six things: (1) loss of wealth, (2) various diseases, (3) increased conflict, (4) exposure of secrets, (5) lack of discrimination and self-protection, and (6) total loss of wisdom and an increase in ignorance.⁴³¹

As a consumable item, alcohol is mentioned in connection with food, but it is an altogether different substance. In the *Mahīśāsaka vinaya* alcohol is mentioned in connection with eating meat.⁴³² In the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya*, drinking alcohol is mentioned in connection with both untimely eating and lust; the *vinaya* text says that these three, untimely eating, drinking alcohol and having sexual intercourse are acceptable in lay society but not for monastics.⁴³³ The reason why alcohol is dealt with separately from other consumables is that it can cause various individual and social problems.

Based on the classification by Buddhaghosa, Maria Heim groups the *pāṭimokkha* into ‘blameworthy’ and ‘blameless’ precepts. She explains further these two expressions based on Buddhaghosa and the *Milindapañha*:

Buddhaghosa interprets blameworthy offenses to be “blamable for the world” (*lokvajja*), while blameless offenses are “blamable because of the rules” (*paṇṇattivajja*).⁴³⁴ The first are actions that are universally condemned, such as killing and so on, that are blameworthy no matter who commits them, and the second are actions proscribed only for monastics. Interestingly, the *Milindapañho* picks up this distinction and says that the 10 bad actions (*akusalakammamapatha*) are

⁴³⁰ T. II. p. 591b.

⁴³¹ T. I. p. 639c.

⁴³² T. XXII. p. 4a; p. 21c.

⁴³³ T. XXII. p. 289b.

⁴³⁴ Vin. V. p. 115; Sp. VII. p. 1319 cited Heim 2014: 146.

blameworthy universally, but actions like eating at the wrong time or playing in water are blameworthy only for monastics.⁴³⁵

Pāli *pācittiya* rule 51, prohibiting the drinking of alcohol, provides the following story of its establishment. Near Kosambi, a matted-haired ascetic had a poisonous snake with psychic powers, of which lay people were afraid. However, a Buddhist monk, Sāgata, visited the ascetic's hermitage. When Sāgata entered the room where the snake lived, it attacked him, but he overpowered it. When the monk later entered Kosambi for alms, some lay people asked Sāgata if there was anything hard to obtain which he liked. Rather than Sāgata, it was the Group of Six Monks who answered them, saying:

There is fine red-coloured alcohol. It is hard for monks to obtain but monks like it. Give that.⁴³⁶ Having drunk it, Sāgata, fell down at the gate of Kosambi. The Buddha witnessed this scene with his disciples and so prohibited monks from drinking alcohol, enumerating the reasons: (1) loss of manners (drunken Sāgata slept with his feet towards the Buddha), (2) loss of physical capability (drunken Sāgata could not have handled the snake), and (3) uneatable food (drinking alcohol causes unconsciousness).⁴³⁷ This focuses on the consequences of drinking alcohol rather than the craving for it.

The equivalent rule in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, *pācittiya* 51, narrates a similar story. This time it is the king of Kosambi who treats Sāgata to tasty food and black liquor in gratitude for his dealing with the snake. Sāgata gets drunk, falls on the ground, and throws up. The Buddha rebukes him, pointing out that a drunken Sāgata could not handle even a small snake. Further, the Buddha preaches the tenfold disadvantageous consequences of drinking alcohol as follows: (1) bad complexion, (2)

⁴³⁵ Mil. p. 266 cited Heim 2014:146. Heim 2014: 146.

⁴³⁶ Vin. IV. p. 109.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.* p. 110.

loss of physical power, (3) poor eyesight, (4) loss of temper, (5) destruction of livelihood and wealth, (6) increase in disease, (7) increase in conflict, (8) loss of fame and spreading of infamy, (9) decrease in wisdom, and (10) causing people to fall into the three bad rebirths (among the six rebirth states of the Sphere of Desire) when they die.⁴³⁸

The *pācittiya* 51 in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, *pācittiya* 76 in the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* and *pācittiya* 79 in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* all contain the same story.⁴³⁹

Additionally, at the beginning of its narrative, *pācittiya* 57 in the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* gives examples of the behaviour of monks who became drunk before the rule was established. They fell into pits, collided with walls, ripped their clothes, broke their bowls or harmed their own bodies,⁴⁴⁰ all of which caused the laity to criticise their manners as unsuitable for monks. In this *vinaya* the wish for meat and alcohol is put into Sāgata's mouth. So whereas, in the other *vinaya*, Sāgata is a naive victim of the generosity or trickery of others in this case he explicitly requests meat and alcohol, and Sāgata's downfall is linked with his uncontrolled attachment to alcohol.

To sum up, although it mentioned the sensibilities of lay people, the rule against alcohol was primarily concerned with the dangers of alcohol *per se*. In contrast in the narratives for the rules proscribing certain behaviour in relation to food the primary concern is with the sensibilities of lay people. The narratives repeatedly give accounts of monks [and nuns] behaving in accordance with lay people's expectations of renouncer behaviour. They are also concerned with monks getting into difficulties whilst trying to seek food at the wrong time or by trying to avoid the effort of collecting food, for example. The problems the rules seek to avoid include:

- showing too great a concern with the taste of food

⁴³⁸ T. XXII. p. 672a.

⁴³⁹ *ibid.* pp. 386c-387a; T. XXIII. pp. 120c-121a.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.* p. 59c.

- showing preference for a particular type of food
- showing too great a concern with the quantity of food
- consuming it at inappropriate times after midday
- participating too much in lay society, and becoming un-renouncer-like, concerned with worldly affairs
- travelling at dangerous times
- seeking to monopolise a source of food
- making too many demands of a single, generous donor
- offending lay devotees' sensibilities in relation to the gratitude for the offering of food
- interfering with lay donors' other religious practices, such as making food offerings for animals or the departed
- stealing what was intended for others, again seen in relation to offerings of food for the departed
- offending against standards of decency (e.g. not eating from the floor like a dog).
- issues of hygiene, such as the vermin attracted to stored food
- causing misunderstandings, e.g. the monk suspected of eating human flesh during an epidemic because he had stored food and not been going on his alms round.
- specifying the extent to which Buddhist monks either with a leaning towards ascetic practices, or in dire need, might or might not follow the ascetic practices relating to food pursued by other renouncer traditions.

Unlike the narratives discussed in chapter two, the stories here are not primarily about warning monks about the problems resulting from giving in to craving for food. They are primarily about shaping the practices of monks and making clear the

expectations of lay people. The above rules apply to nuns too, but for nuns there are additional rules, which will be discussed in chapter four.

The *pācittiya* rules concerning food focus on how monks obtain food. In the final section of this chapter we shall turn to the *sekhiya* rules, which deal with how they eat it once they have it.

3-4. The rules of training (*sekhiya dhammā*) in relation to food

The Pali *sekhiya* rules consist of 75 items and form the final section of rules applying to individuals in the Pali *pāṭimokkha*.⁴⁴¹ The *sekhiya* rules deal with the daily routine of monastic life for monks [and nuns], as well as novices. Therefore novices undertake them alongside the ten precepts. The number of the *sekhiya* rules varies amongst the major *vinaya*: the Mahāsāṃghika has 66⁴⁴²; the Dharmaguptaka, 100⁴⁴³; the Mahīśāsaka, 100⁴⁴⁴ and the Sarvāstivāda 107.⁴⁴⁵ The 75 Pāli *sekhiya* rules can be grouped into four sections:

1. Manners of dressing and religious practices (26 articles, 1st to 26th)
2. Manners of eating (20 articles, 27th to 56th)
3. Manners of teaching Dhamma (16 articles, 57th to 72nd)
4. Manners of excretion (3 articles, 73rd to 75th)⁴⁴⁶

The commentary of the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, the *Sapoduo pini piposha* (薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙), classifies the *sekhiya* rules into six groups as follows:

1. Dressing: 16 articles
2. Visiting laity's houses: 41 articles

⁴⁴¹ Vin. IV. pp. 185-206.

⁴⁴² T. XXII. pp. 399b-412b.

⁴⁴³ *ibid.* pp. 698a-713c.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 73c-77b.

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 133c-141b.

⁴⁴⁶ Hirakawa 1994: 463-464.

3. Receiving food: 27 articles
4. Preaching Dhamma: 19 articles
5. Excretion, saliva and tears: 3 articles
6. No climbing trees taller than human height: 1 article.⁴⁴⁷

Among the *sekhiya* rules, we shall deal with the rules concerning food and eating, namely from 27th article to 56th article of the Pali *sekhiya* list and their parallels in other *vinayas*. I shall provide the rules out of order in accordance with how I categorise these rules into one set dealing with craving for flavour or greed for the amount, and the rest dealing with other aspects of decorum when eating. All of these rules are set in the narrative context of the bad behaviour of the Group of Six Monks.

1. The craving for food:

29th rule: I will receive almsfood with bean curry in proper proportion: a training to be observed.⁴⁴⁸

30th rule: I will receive almsfood level with the edge (of the bowl): a training to be observed.⁴⁴⁹

34th rule: I will eat almsfood with bean curry in proper proportion: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁰

36th rule: I will not hide bean curry and foods with rice out of a desire to get more: a training to be observed.⁴⁵¹

37th rule: Not being ill, I will not eat rice or bean curry that I have requested for my own sake: a training to be observed.⁴⁵²

38th rule: I will not look at another's bowl intent on finding fault: a training to be observed.⁴⁵³

39th rule: I will not take an extra-large mouthful: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 463-464; T. XXIII. p. 562a.

⁴⁴⁸ Vin. IV. p. 190.

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁰ Vin. IV. p. 192.

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵² Vin. IV. p. 193.

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 194.

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.* Translation of these seven rules here and above by Thanissaro Bhikkhus. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#sk-part2> on 27/7/2015.

These seven *sekhiya* rules are to ensure that monks should not act on their desire for particular tastes or for a particular amount by altering how they receive or eat food. The first six of them relate to the time when monks receive food and the last, the 39th rule, relates to the time when monks eat food.

2. Manners toward eating and food

27th rule: I will receive almsfood appreciatively: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁵

28th rule: I will receive almsfood with attention focused on the bowl: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁶

31st rule: I will eat almsfood appreciatively: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁷

32nd rule: I will eat almsfood with attention focused on the bowl: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁸

33rd rule: I will eat almsfood methodically: a training to be observed.⁴⁵⁹

35th rule: I will not eat almsfood taking mouthfuls from a heap: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁰

40th rule: I will make a rounded mouthful: a training to be observed.⁴⁶¹

41st rule: I will not open the mouth when the mouthful has yet to be brought to it: a training to be observed.⁴⁶²

42nd rule: I will not insert the whole hand into the mouth while eating: a training to be observed.⁴⁶³

43rd rule: I will not speak with the mouth full of food: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁴

44th rule: I will not eat from lifted balls of food: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁵

45th rule: I will not eat nibbling at mouthfuls of food: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁶

46th rule: I will not eat stuffing out the cheeks: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁷

47th rule: I will not eat shaking (food off) the hand: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁵⁵ Vin. IV. p. 190.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁷ Vin. IV. p. 191.

⁴⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶⁰ Vin. IV. p. 192.

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.* p. 194.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.* p.195.

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.* p.196.

⁴⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

- 48th rule: I will not eat scattering lumps of rice about: a training to be observed.⁴⁶⁹
- 49th rule: I will not eat sticking out the tongue: a training to be observed.⁴⁷⁰
- 50th rule: I will not eat smacking the lips: a training to be observed.⁴⁷¹
- 51st rule: I will not eat making a slurping noise: a training to be observed.⁴⁷²
- 52nd rule: I will not eat licking the hands: a training to be observed.⁴⁷³
- 53rd rule: I will not eat licking the bowl: a training to be observed.⁴⁷⁴
- 54th rule: I will not eat licking the lips: a training to be observed.⁴⁷⁵
- 55th rule: I will not accept a water vessel with a hand soiled by food: a training to be observed.⁴⁷⁶
- 56th rule: I will not, in an inhabited area, throw away bowl-rinsing water that has grains of rice in it: a training to be observed.⁴⁷⁷

These are the *sekhiya* rules which regulate manners related to receiving food, eating it and immediately after eating (washing a bowl out). These rules on table manners include some rules that prevent monks acting on craving, but they are primarily related to appropriate decorum and in particular about how to eat in front of lay donors. They anticipate food both received and eaten on an alms round, and food consumed at a meal by invitation or at a food distribution centre, and are in contrast to those narratives that portray monks first begging for alms then returning to their own abodes to eat it. It seems to me that the ‘food section’ in the Pali *sekhiya* has codified the issues primarily related to eating food when monks are invited to meals donated by lay people.⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.* p.197.

⁴⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.* p.198.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p.199. Translation of these twenty three rules above by Thanissaro Bhikkhus. Accessed from <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#sk-part2> on 27/7/2015.

⁴⁷⁸ Hirakawa 1994: 472.

In the relationship between Buddhist Sangha and laity, food routinely provides the main point of contact and interaction. Through food and eating, these two groups acquire what they need, sustenance and religious merit respectively. In addition, it sets the scene in which the laity judge the general features of a particular monk as an renunciant. Unlike the alms round, in which eating food is separate from obtaining food, an invitation meal for monks includes both the obtaining and eating of food. They also allow for situations monks may encounter in which secular societal and renunciants' cultures and regulations related to food might be in conflict and an individual monk's disposition and manners related to food could be exposed in front of the laity. Accordingly, they regulate in detail the manners of monks in relation to food and eating. The Pali *sekhiya* rules are established for situations in which monks meet the laity through food which is why they cover manners as well as the need to control craving for food.

While a number of the rules we have examined address behaviour, some of which may be motivated by craving, none of them address the craving itself. It is to this subject that we shall turn in chapter 6, where we will look at meditation designed to influence the individual's internal response to food.

3-5. Conclusion

The *vinaya* rules on food occupy the biggest part as a single subject. Even though their severity is not as high as the *pārājikā* and the *saṅghādisesa*, these rules have considerable significance in daily life for monastics. As the Kosambi quarrel has shown us, the behaviour of Buddhist monks is considered as the most important standard for lay followers to support and prop up the Buddhist Sangha through respect and material goods.

The ten rules on food in the Pali *pācittiya* are partly related to craving for food, but they focus more on a harmonious relationship with lay society because these ten *pācittiya* rules are related to procuring food from lay people before eating. Even though these ten rules emphasize more the sensibilities of lay people, some of them explicitly have the function of controlling craving caused by food. The Pali *pācittiya* 51 prohibits drinking alcohol. In Pali Buddhism the problems caused by alcohol are mentioned in various aspects: 1) it causes individual and social problems such as the loss of health, wealth, fame, etc. and such as killing, stealing, fight and so on, 2) it causes problems to the religious life such as loss of mindfulness, violation of the *vinaya* rules, and so on, and 3) it causes problems concerning food such as untimely eating, further indulgence in alcohol, and so on. The *sekhiya* rules are related to the situation in which monks procure and eat food surrounded by lay people. Therefore, these rules emphasise controlling the craving for food, but still more, decorum appropriate to a renouncer. These *pācittiya* and *sekhiya* rules make monks act as renouncers, maintain the Sangha and preserve it for the future.

Chapter Four

Additional Food Rules for Nuns

The rules in the Pāli *vinaya* are sometimes classified into two kinds: shared rules (*sādhāraṇa*) and non-shared rules (*asādhāraṇa*). This refers to the fact that some rules apply to both monks and nuns, whereas non-shared rules apply only to monks or nuns. Among those rules in the Pali *vinaya* that concern food, there are 12 ‘unshared’ rules, given in the table below, which apply only to nuns. It is such unshared rules that I shall examine in this chapter.

Total number of nun rules	Unshared rules for nuns
1. Remaining (<i>saṅghādisesa</i>): 17	Nos. 5-6, prohibition of accepting food from men who have lust (2 rules)
2. Expiation (<i>pācittiya</i>): 166	No. 1, the rule on garlic; No. 7, the rule on boiling raw grain (2 rules)
3. Confession (<i>pāṭidesaniya</i>): 8	Nos. 1-8, the rules on luxury food stuffs (8 rules)

Table 4.1. Unshared food rules for nuns

The first two rules in the above table, the 5th and 6th *saṅghādisesa* rules, even though they mention food, in fact relate more to sexual interaction, in that they seek to ensure that food is not a medium of contact between a nun and a man offering food, even if the nun herself is not interested in the man:

5. Should any nun, lusting, having received staple or non-staple food from the hand of a lusting man, consume or chew it: this nun, also, as soon as she has fallen into the first act of offence, is to be (temporarily) driven out, and it entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁹ Vin. IV. p. 233: *yā pana bhikkhunī avassutā avassutassa purisapuggalassa hatthato khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā sahatthā paṭiggahetvā khadeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā , ayam pi bhikkhunī pathamāpattikaṃ dhammaṃ āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṅghādisesam*. Translation by Thanissaro Bhikkhu at <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhuni-pati.html#sg> visited on 25th June 2015.

6. Should any nun say, "What does it matter to you whether this man is lusting or not, when you are not lusting? Please, lady, take what the man is giving — staple or non-staple food — with your own hand and consume or chew it": this nun [the one encouraging the violation], also, as soon as she has fallen into the first act of offence, is to be (temporarily) driven out, and it entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.⁴⁸⁰

The additional food-related rules in the Expiation (*pācittiya*) and the Confession (*pāṭidesanīya*) sections concern food itself, though – as we shall see – aspects of sexuality remain in the background. Here, then, we shall focus on these two parts of the *bhikkhunī pāṭimokkha* that provide additional rules concerning food.

4-1. The *bhikkhunī pācittiya* rules

4-1-1. The *bhikkhunī pācittiya* rule 1 on garlic.

“Should any nun eat garlic, it is to be confessed.”⁴⁸¹

The Pali *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 1 is the regulation that nuns should not eat garlic. Monks are also prohibited from consuming garlic in the *vinaya* but not in the *pāṭimokkha* rules: for monks it is only a minor offence, the violation of the wrongdoing rule (*dukkata*).⁴⁸² Almost all the extant *vinaya* (the Pali, the Dharmaguptaka, the Mahīśāsaka, and the Sarvāstivāda) place it as the 1st *pācittiya* for nuns, the only

⁴⁸⁰ Vin. IV. p. 234: yā pana bhikkhunī evaṃ vadeyya: kin te aye eso purisapuggalo karissati avassuto vā anavassuto vā yato tvaṃ anavassutā ingh’ aye yan te eso purisapuggalo deti khādaniyaṃ vā bhojaniyaṃ vā taṃ tvaṃ sahatthā patiggahetvā khāda vā bhunja vā’ti, ayam pi bhikkhuni paṭhamāpattikaṃ dhammam āpannā nissāraṇiyaṃ saṃghādisesam. (Translation Thanissaro Bhikkhu visited on 25th June 2015 at <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhuni-pati.html#sg>).

⁴⁸¹ Vin. IV. p. 259. Yā pana bhikkhunī lasuṇaṃ khādeyya pācittiyaṃ. Translation Thanissaro Bhikkhu visited on 1st July 2015 at <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhuni-pati.html#pc-part1>.

⁴⁸² Vin. II. p. 140; T. XXIII. p. 275b.

exception being the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya*, where it is the 10th *pācittiya*. In order to explore the Pali *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 1 on garlic, we shall look at the background story for its establishment:

Now at that time the Order of nuns was offered garlic by a certain lay-follower, saying: “If these ladies need garlic, I (can supply them) with garlic.” And the keeper of the field was instructed (with the words): “If the nuns come, give two or three bundles to each nun.” Now at that time there was a festival in *Sāvatthī*; the garlic was used up as soon as it was brought in. The nuns, having approached that lay-follower, spoke thus: “Sir, we have need of garlic.” He said: “there is none, ladies; the garlic is used up as soon as it is brought in; go to the field.” The nun *Thullanandā*, having gone to the field, not knowing moderation, had much garlic taken away. The keeper of the field looked down upon, criticised, spread it about, saying: “How can these nuns, not knowing moderation, have taken so much garlic away?” ...

The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How, monks, can the nun *Thullanandā*, not knowing moderation, have much garlic taken away? ... “Whatever nun should eat garlic, there is an offence of expiation.”⁴⁸³

Here the establishment of the rule is attributed to the nun *Thullanandā*’s immoderation in taking too much of the crop from the field, presumably because it was in some way needed at the festival. It seems that this rule is laid down to regulate decent social behaviour towards lay people, although the connection between the problem in the background story – the gathering of too much garlic – and the rule, prohibiting the eating of garlic, is unclear. The motive of regulating conduct towards lay people is affirmed by a parable given in the background story to *pācittiya* 1:

Formerly, monks, the nun, *Thullanandā*, was the wife of a certain Brahmin and there were three daughters, *Nandā*, *Nandavatī*, *Sundarīnandā*. Then, monks, that Brahmin, having passed away, was born in the womb of a certain goose and his feathers were made all of gold. He gave a feather one by one to these. Then, monks, the nun *Thullanandā*, saying: ‘This goose is giving us a feather one by one,’ having taken hold of that king of the geese, plucked him.

⁴⁸³ I B. Horner 1993: 243-244.

His feathers, on growing again, turned out white. So at that time, monks, the nun

Thullanandā lost the gold through too much greed; now she will lose the garlic.⁴⁸⁴

Jātaka 136 is a longer and more detailed version of this same story.⁴⁸⁵ Interestingly, the *Suttavibhaṅga* commentary to this rule in the Pāli *vinaya* goes on to state “there is no offence if it is an onion”⁴⁸⁶ in stark contrast to the Mahāyāna views on the Five Pungent Vegetables (garlic, onion, chive, scallion and asafoetida). Out of these five, the consumption of garlic and onions is prohibited.⁴⁸⁷ The other three items are not mentioned.

By drawing the parallel between gold and garlic, this text seems to suggest that garlic is not considered impure.⁴⁸⁸ This contrasts with the negative viewpoints of Hindu *Dharmasūtras* or the *Tathāgatagarbha sūtras* in Mahāyāna Buddhism, which see garlic as an impure substance, as we shall see later in this chapter.

The background story of the *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 1 in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* is a very similar story to that in the Pāli. There, the nun Thullanandā frequently goes to the garlic field with a female novice, *samanerī*, and a trainee nun, *sikkhamanā*. They take the whole crop of garlic on the farm even though the owner only permitted each nun five bunches of garlic.⁴⁸⁹ The Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* similarly attributes the rule to a lay person suffering loss; in this case the result is a financial problem, on account of his donating garlic to nuns:

⁴⁸⁴ I B. Horner 1993: 244.

⁴⁸⁵ J. I. p. 474.

⁴⁸⁶ I B. Horner 1993: 244.

⁴⁸⁷ T. XXIV. p. 1005b. It is very interesting to explore the history of garlic and onion in Buddhist texts from the Pali *vinaya* to the Mahāyāna via the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* (T. XXIII. p. 230b). In the Pali *vinaya*, garlic is prohibited and onion is permitted; in the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*, both garlic and onion are prohibited, but one who eats onion is punished less severely [7 days isolation for eating garlic; 3 days isolation for onion]; in Mahāyāna texts both garlic and onion are punished equally. See Ann Heirman 2006: 62.

⁴⁸⁸ The drawing of a parallel with gold may relate to the use to which the garlic is being put in the festival.

⁴⁸⁹ T. XXII. p. 737a.

A merchant had donated his garlic to nuns and on that account he fell into poverty and it was hard for him to procure food. His family said to him, “If you cannot support us, then let us leave you and you can become a slave of nuns.” His neighbour, having heard this, said, “You do not have food for your family, then, why do you blame nuns for it?” Having heard the whole story [from him], the man who was not a follower of Buddhism said to him, “You fell into poverty since you associated with nuns. Were you to associate with them again, it would be yet more serious than this. These nuns are supposed to be renouncers who seek liberation, but here they are craving for delicacies. This is not the behaviour of renouncers. It goes against the custom of renouncers.”

Having heard this, senior nuns rebuked them in many ways. ... If a nun eats garlic, that violates an Expiation rule. If she eats raw garlic, then, that violates an Expiation rule. If she eats cooked garlic, it is a wrongdoing (*dukkata*).⁴⁹⁰

Unlike the stories above, which focus on the adverse effect on the donor, the nun *Mahīśāsaka vinaya* focuses on the smell of garlic as the reason why this rule is established:

At that time, nuns consumed raw or cooked garlic before and after noon. Sometimes they ate only garlic and sometimes they consumed garlic with rice. As a result, the places where they lived smelled of garlic. Lay people could smell this and criticised (them). “This smells just like the dining room of lay people.” When nuns visited a rich lay person, the lay person could smell the garlic from the nuns and said to them. “Go far away. Your breath stinks of garlic.” [So] the nuns felt ashamed.⁴⁹¹

Unlike the previous stories, which were about the effects of taking too much from lay people, this background story attributes the establishment of the rule to the problem caused by a property of garlic itself, namely its smell. (The story also deals with raw and cooked garlic as two different ways of preparation, to which I shall return later in this chapter.) Since this is not the only context in which the properties of garlic elicit an extreme response and give it a mixed reputation, I shall now briefly survey some of

⁴⁹⁰ T. XXII. p. 86c. Author’s translation.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.*

the ways in which its smell has informed reactions to it in various civilizations and countries.

In his book, *Plants of life, Plants of death* the cultural geographer, Frederick J. Simoons, surveys responses to the smell of garlic. He introduces a remark by Sir John Evelyn, that the odour of garlic has an “unacceptable pungency which not only renders it unfit for use in salads but also in the past, led the eating of garlic to be included among the punishment meted out for the vilest of crimes.”⁴⁹² Simoons also mentions that in Hindu India, odour is considered a potential pollutant.⁴⁹³ The impure smell of garlic is associated with “underworld forces and its use in repelling evil”⁴⁹⁴ Simoons quotes a 5th-century CE Buddhist medical treatise in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, the Bower Manuscript, which says that the first garlic was generated from the blood of a demon killed by Viṣṇu.⁴⁹⁵ Its reputed function to ward off evil goes back at least to Roman times: “In a Roman comedy by Titinius (fl. 150 BCE), one character states that strings of garlic rebuff witches.”⁴⁹⁶

In ancient India the dominant view, as found in brahmanical literature, seems to be that garlic and its relatives are impure foodstuffs:

For India, on the other hand, the evidence from the *Sūtra* period (c. 500 B.C-A.D. 100) onward is quite clear. In early India, garlic (Sanskrit: *laśuna*), sometimes with onion (*palāndu*) or leeks, was banned to Brahmins and other respectable castes who required penance for violation, as they did for tasting alcohol or unclean bodily excretions or for eating pork or beef.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹² Sokolov 1975: 70-71 cited in Simoons 1998: 140.

⁴⁹³ Simoons 1998: 138.

⁴⁹⁴ *ibid*: 141.

⁴⁹⁵ *ibid*.

⁴⁹⁶ *ibid*.

⁴⁹⁷ *ibid*: 152.

There are the four Hindu *Dharmasūtras*: the *Āpastamba*, the *Gautama*, the *Baudhāyana*, and the *Vāsiṣṭha*⁴⁹⁸ and they prohibit garlic and other pungent vegetables as follows:

Dharma Sūtras	Āpastamba	Gautama	Baudhāyana	Vasiṣṭha
Prohibited garlic-related vegetables	<i>karañja</i> garlic, Onion and leek ⁴⁹⁹	garlic ⁵⁰⁰		Garlic, onion, <i>Gṛnjana</i> onion ⁵⁰¹
Other prohibited vegetables	mushrooms ⁵⁰²	Mushrooms and young shoots ⁵⁰³		Mushrooms ⁵⁰⁴

Table 4.2. Pungent and other vegetables prohibited in the four *Dharmasūtras*

Patrick Olivelle has explored the two terms, *abhakṣya* and *abhojya*, which are used for classification of prohibited and unfit food.⁵⁰⁵ According to him, *abhakṣya* is

⁴⁹⁸ P.V. Kane dates the four *Dharmasūtras* as follows:

1. The *Gautama* (600-400 BCE)
2. The *Baudhāyana* (500-200 BCE)
3. The *Āpastamba* (450-350 [??]BCE)
4. The *Vāsiṣṭha* (300-100 BCE)

P.V. Kane (1974), *History of Dharma sūtra*, vol. I, part 1. pp.22-112. Olivelle, however, does not propose specific dates for each *Dharmasūtra*, but suggests the order of the establishment of the four as follows (Olivelle 1999: xxxi):

1. The *Āpastamba*
2. The *Gautama*
3. The *Baudhāyana*
4. The *Vāsiṣṭha*

On that which is older between the *Āpastamba* and the *Gautama Dharmasūtra*, G. Bühler, P.V. Kane, R. Lingat, and S. C. Banerjee assert that the *Gautama* precedes the *Āpastamba*, but P.Olivelle, B. K. Ghose, J. J. Meyer and R. P.Kangle argue that *Āpastamba* has been established earlier than the *Gautama*. Olivelle 1999: xxviii.

⁴⁹⁹ ADh. 17.26.

⁵⁰⁰ GDh. 17.32.

⁵⁰¹ VDh. 14.33.

⁵⁰² ADh. 17.28.

⁵⁰³ GDh. 17.32.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰⁵ Olivelle 2002: 345-354.

“forbidden food”, food which we should not consume. It consists of animal and vegetable foods that should not be consumed, except in a situation in which it is impossible to survive without eating them. In the *Dharmasūtras* these foodstuffs (*abhakṣya*) are identified by the names of foodstuffs rather than the name of dishes.⁵⁰⁶ The *Gautama Dharmasūtra*, which has the most detailed lists of forbidden foodstuffs among the four *Dharmasūtras*, enumerates the *abhakṣya* foodstuffs as follows:

The following are forbidden foods: animals with five claws, with the exception of the hedgehog, hare, porcupine, Godhā monitor lizard, rhinoceros, and tortoise; animals with teeth in both jaws, with a lot of hair, or without any hair; one-hoofed animals; Kalaviṅka sparrows; Plava herons; Cakravāka geese; Haṃsa geese; crows; Kaṅka herons; vultures; falcons; water birds; red-footed and red-beaked birds; village cocks and pigs; milch-cows and oxen; meat of animals whose milk-teeth have not fallen and of animals that are sick or wantonly killed ; young shoots; mushrooms; garlic; resins; red juices flowing from incisions on trees; woodpeckers; Baka egrets; Balāka ibis; parrots; Madgu cormorants; Ṭiṭṭibha sandpipers; Māndhālā flying foxes; and night birds.⁵⁰⁷

In contrast, *abhojya* is merely “unfit food.”⁵⁰⁸ This is food which can normally be eaten, but which, after a change in the condition of the food, we cannot. Such food is identified by the names of dishes rather than the names of foodstuffs.

The *Gautama Dharmasūtra* enumerates *abhojya* food as follows:

The following are unfit to be eaten: food into which hair or an insect has fallen; what has been touched by a menstruating woman, a black bird, or someone’s foot; what has been looked at by an abortionist or smelt by a cow; food that looks revolting; food that has turned sour, except curd; re-cooked food; food that has become stale, except vegetables, chewy or greasy foods, meat, and honey; food given by someone who has been disowned by his parents, a harlot, heinous sinner, a hermaphrodite, a law enforcement agent, a carpenter, a miser, a jailer, a physician, a man who hunts without using the bow or eats the leftovers of others, a group of people, or an enemy, as also by those listed before a bald man as people

⁵⁰⁶ Olivelle 2002: 346.

⁵⁰⁷ Olivelle 1999: 109.

⁵⁰⁸ Olivelle 2002: 346.

who defile those alongside whom they eat; food prepared for to no avail; a meal during which people sip water or get up against the rules, or at which different sorts of homage are paid to people of equal stature and the same homage is paid to people of different stature; and food that is given disrespectfully.⁵⁰⁹

In the *Dharmasūtras* garlic and its relatives are defined as *abhakṣya* food which should not be consumed except for survival. Garlic and its relatives are considered highly impure in the *Dharmasūtras*

The later *Dharmaśāstras* inherit the *Dharmasūtras*' position. For example, *Manusmṛti* identifies garlic, leek and onion as “forbidden food (*abhakṣya*).⁵¹⁰ Below are the prohibited pungent vegetables in the *Manusmṛti* and *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (the 3rd-5th C.E.).

Title of the text	<i>Manusmṛti</i>	<i>Yājñavalkyasmṛti</i>
Prohibited pungent vegetables	garlic, leek and onion ⁵¹¹	garlic, leek and onion ⁵¹²
Other prohibited vegetables	mushrooms	mushrooms

Table 4.3. Prohibited vegetables in the *Manusmṛti* and the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*

The violation of the regulation of *abhakṣya* is followed by relatively stringent consequences and the expectation of penance in such Hindu literature. According to the *Manusmṛti*:

The twice-born lose their caste if they intentionally eat garlic, onion, leek, mushroom, village pig, and poultry. If he consumes one of these six food items, without realizing them,

⁵⁰⁹ Olivelle 1999: 108-109. Other references to MS are to Olivelle's translation. Three other *Dharmasūtras* also have the lists of *abhakṣya* and *abhojya* foodstuffs:

1. Āpastamba: A: *abhakṣya* (1.17.14-39); B: *abhojya* (1.16.16-32)
2. Baudhāyana: A: *abhakṣya* (1.12.1-15); B: *abhojya* (1.9.8)
3. Vasiṣṭha: A: *abhakṣya* (14.33-48); B: *abhojya* (14.1-32).

⁵¹⁰ MS. 5.4.

⁵¹¹ *Ibid.*

⁵¹² YDh. 1.176.

he should perform the ceremony of penance called *sāntapana* or *cāndrāyaṇa* [see below].⁵¹³ If

he consumes another food item which is prohibited, he should fast for a day.⁵¹⁴

The *Manusmṛti* takes another example in which the offender loses the status of his caste:

By the marriage to a *śūdra* woman, by the begetting a son with a *śūdra* woman, by begetting his son through a *śūdra* woman, he loses his caste.⁵¹⁵

In this text, consuming garlic is equated with marriage to a *śūdra* woman: in both cases they lose their caste status, which is the severest non-physical punishment in high-caste Hindu society. In the case of unintentionally eating forbidden food, there are penances that can atone for the transgression and that allow one to retain one's caste, and these involve 'purifying' one's mouth through consuming purifying (but perhaps in our view also disgusting) substances – the excreta along with the dairy products of a cow. Thus, in the *sāntapana* penalty mentioned in the above quotation, the violator should consume the food which is cooked with urine and faeces of cow, curd, ghee, water and *Kuśa* grass for 12 days and he should fast for one of 12 days.⁵¹⁶ The *cāndrāyaṇa* penance is less severe: the violator should consume eight mouthfuls of food which has been offered as the food in a ritual.⁵¹⁷

The most remarkable characteristic of these views in the Hindu texts that govern caste behaviour is the application of notions of purity and impurity of caste (*varṇa*) to the purity of or impurity of food. Remarkably, in spite of Buddhism's explicit rejection of caste notions of purity and impurity, as seen in chapter 1, and in spite of Buddhism's explicit rejection of the type of abstention from food practised by other renouncer groups of the day, as seen in chapter 2, we find in some of the

⁵¹³ MS. 11. 228.

⁵¹⁴ MS. 5.19-20.

⁵¹⁵ MS. 3. 16.

⁵¹⁶ MS. 11. 213.

⁵¹⁷ MS. 11. 228.

Buddhist *vinaya* similar measures recommended against anyone who has eaten garlic or its relatives. In the Buddhist case, such measures are always temporary. The recommended practice is termed the ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’ and is different from the *pācittiya* rule and *dukkāṭa* prohibition on garlic. The ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’ is not found in the Pali and the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, but is found in the Mahāsāṃghika, the Mahīśāsaka, the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*. The countermeasure applies because a monk (or nun) may eat garlic as a medicine if ill, but needs to then take certain measures to avoid the smell polluting the community:

When [monks] eat garlic, [they] should follow the ‘Countermeasure for Garlic.’ What is it, to follow the ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’? The monks, who have eaten garlic, should not meet the Buddha, their preceptor (P: *upajjhāya*, Sk: *upādhyāya*), their instructor (P: *acariya*, Sk: *ācārya*), any senior monks or go to *stūpas* of the Buddha, *stūpas* of the Buddha’s disciples, warm rooms, or the dining hall for monks. Such monks should not stand outside other monks’ rooms, should not defecate or urinate [see below], and should not enter the bathroom or any place where many people are sitting; they must stay in a room which is enclosed on all four sides. If they are in dire need of defecating or urinating, they should make a servant dig the place where they can relieve themselves. If there is not a servant to do that, they should go far away to defecate and urinate in a place which is enclosed. Once they are recovering from an illness, they should clean and sprinkle their rooms and the paths and dust off the bedding, beds and chair. If the smell persists, they should wash themselves. These monks [who have consumed garlic] should dust their lower body after coming out of the room and closing the door. They should go out only after dusting their lower body.⁵¹⁸

According to this passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*, the monk, who has fallen ill may have consumed garlic for medicinal reasons but is then isolated from all of other members of the Sangha and places in the monastery, as well as the sacred sites, the *stūpas*. Thus these places will not be contaminated. According to the Mūlasarvāstivāda

⁵¹⁸ T. XXIII, p. 275c. Author’s translation from the *Ayuwang jing* (阿育王經).

text, the *Genben sapoduobu lushe* (根本薩婆多部律攝), one who has eaten garlic is also prohibited from worshipping the statue of the Buddha, from giving a *dhamma* talk to the laity or from accepting an invitation to teach *dhamma*.⁵¹⁹

This strict attitude to garlic in certain Buddhist *vinayas* suggests that we should explore the attitude to garlic in secular society. What was the attitude to garlic in the contemporary secular society? The Buddhist *sūtra*, the *Ayuwang jing* (阿育王經) recounts an anecdote involving King Aśoka and garlic:

At that time, King Aśoka contracted a serious illness. Faeces came out of his mouth and various impure liquids flowed out from his pores. Even the most outstanding doctors could not cure him....

At that time, the Queen explained to King Aśoka the nature of his illness to him and recommended that he should eat garlic to cure it. The King replied, “I am a *kṣatriya* [of the warrior caste] and cannot eat garlic. The Queen said to him again, “Please eat it in order to live, understanding it to be a medicine.” Finally King Aśoka ate the garlic and the parasites were killed. His health was restored. Then, he took a cleansing bath and said to the Queen, “Now tell me what is your desire?”⁵²⁰

In this *sūtra*, King Aśoka refuses to eat garlic because of the high-caste food taboo found in Hindu *Dharmasūtra* literature as discussed above. After recovering from the illness, he takes a bath for purification. The occurrence of this story in a Buddhist text suggests that the monks were conscious that their own rules in relation to garlic related to caste purity restrictions found in lay society, confirming the relationship between certain monastic rules in relation to food and Hindu *dharmaśāstra* regulations concerning food. I shall return to the subject of prohibited foods in my discussion of prohibited meats.

The concept of the ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’, found in the four Buddhist *vinayas* of the Mahīśāsaka, the Mahāsāṃghika, the Sarvāstivāda and the

⁵¹⁹ T. XXIV. p. 571a.

⁵²⁰ T. L. p. 145b. Author’s translation.

Mūlasarvāstivāda, bears significant similarity to the Hindu concept of *abhakṣya*. However, whereas the Hindu penances found in the *Manusmṛti* require the consumption of purificatory food and fasting – in other words, are about purification and penance – the Buddhist countermeasure involves seclusion and cleaning so that the smell would not contaminate other people, places or sacred objects.

The absence of the ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’ from the Pali and the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, which were established comparatively earlier than other four Buddhist *vinaya*, suggests that the acceptance of understandings of *abhakṣya* in accordance with Hindu concepts of impurity was a process that developed over time. In fact, this difference in their approach to food seems to confirm their relatively early chronology. Both the *pācittiya* rule on garlic for nuns and the ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’ for monks and nuns take into consideration other aspects of decency and social decorum, principles at the heart of many *vinaya* rules.

Among the *pācittiya* rules on garlic of the Buddhist *vinaya*, the rule in the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* is, as we saw above, different from the rules in the other *vinaya* in that it states that by eating raw garlic, a nun has committed a *pācittiya* offence, but by eating cooked garlic commits only a *dukkāṭa* offence.⁵²¹ The classification of garlic into raw and cooked is seen in the Dharmaguptaka, the Mahāsāṃghika, the Mahīśāsaka and the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, but not the Pali and Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*. It is only in the Mahīśāsaka that the difference has implications for whether the offence committed is a *pācittiya* or *dukkāṭa* offence. In the table below we can see the development of the categorisation of garlic into its constituent parts, and into wild or cultivated as well. In the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, eating the less pungent parts of garlic, e.g. the skin and root, entails only a *dukkāṭa* offence.

	Pali	Dharmaguptaka	Mahāsāṃghika
--	------	---------------	--------------

⁵²¹ T. XXII. p. 86c.

Conflict with lay people	yes ⁵²²	yes ⁵²³	yes ⁵²⁴
Smell of garlic	no	no	yes ⁵²⁵
<i>Pācittiya</i> Offence for nuns	yes ⁵²⁶	yes, whether raw or cooked ⁵²⁷	yes, whether cultivated or wild, raw or cooked, leaves or skin of garlic. ⁵²⁸
<i>Dukkaṭa</i> offence for nuns, monks, trainee, <i>samanera</i> and <i>samanerī</i> .	yes, if monks eat garlic	yes; <i>dukkāṭa</i> for <i>bhikkhu</i> , <i>sikkhamanā</i> , <i>samanera</i> and <i>samanerī</i> ⁵²⁹	yes, if monks eat garlic
'Countermeasure'	no	no	yes ⁵³⁰

Mahīśāsaka	Sarvāstivāda	Mūlasarvāstivāda
yes ⁵³¹	yes ⁵³²	yes ⁵³³
yes ⁵³⁴	yes ⁵³⁵	yes ⁵³⁶
yes, if nuns eat raw garlic.	yes, whether raw or cooked, small kinds, leaves or stalk.	yes ⁵³⁷
yes, if nuns eat cooked garlic, only a <i>dukkāṭa</i> . If <i>sikkhamanā</i> and <i>sāmanerī</i> eat garlic (<i>dukkāṭa</i>).	yes, if nuns only eat the skin or root it is a <i>dukkāṭa</i> offence. When monks eat garlic (<i>dukkāṭa</i>). ⁵³⁸	yes, if monks eat garlic.
yes ⁵³⁹	yes ⁵⁴⁰	yes ⁵⁴¹

Table 4.4. Classification of *pācittiya* and countermeasure rules on garlic.

⁵²² T. IV. p. 259.

⁵²³ T. XXII. p. 736c-737a.

⁵²⁴ *ibid.* p. 483b.

⁵²⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵²⁶ T. IV. p. 259.

⁵²⁷ T. XXII. p. 737b.

⁵²⁸ *ibid.* p. 530b.

⁵²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 737b.

⁵³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 483b-c.

⁵³¹ *ibid.* p. 86c.

⁵³² T. XXIII. p. 317a-b.

⁵³³ *ibid.* p. 997a.

⁵³⁴ T. XXII. p. 176a.

⁵³⁵ T. XXIII. p. 275b.

⁵³⁶ T. XXIV. p. 230a.

⁵³⁷ T. XXIII. p. 997a.

⁵³⁸ *ibid.* p. 317b.

⁵³⁹ T. XXII. p. 176a.

⁵⁴⁰ T. XXIII. p. 275b-c.

⁵⁴¹ T. XXIV. p. 230b.

Although several of the Buddhist *vinaya* differentiate raw and cooked garlic, among other differences, none provide any explanation for this differentiation. However, we can find out more from those Mahāyāna texts which deal with meat-eating and pungent vegetables such as garlic, onion, etc. As we saw in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*, the reason for prohibiting garlic and other pungent vegetables⁵⁴² is to ensure a harmonious relationship with lay society by avoiding excessive demand for garlic and the repulsive smell it creates. However, the reasons why the Mahāyāna texts prohibit the consumption of garlic and pungent vegetables also include religious ideals that relate to doctrine and meditation. We shall explore these aspects of Mahāyāna texts, those that relate to the prohibition of the consumption of garlic and pungent vegetables, in a later part of this chapter.

The first of the Mahāyāna texts that mentions garlic or other pungent vegetables which we shall examine is the Mahāyāna *Daban niepan jing* (大般涅槃經, *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*). In this text, only garlic is remarked upon.⁵⁴³ Another translation of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* into Chinese, the *Foshuo daban nihuan jing* (佛說大般泥洹經), mentions both garlic and asafoetida.⁵⁴⁴ In this translation, the remark on pungent vegetables is used as a supportive example for explanation of the prohibition of meat-eating. This text mentions only the smell of garlic.

If you eat garlic and go to a place where people gather, those people feel disgusted and hate the smell.⁵⁴⁵

The first of the two Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* translations *Daban niepan jing* (大般涅槃經, *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*) mentions garlic in support of a remark for explaining the major topic, meat-eating.⁵⁴⁶

⁵⁴² T. XXIV. p. 230a.

⁵⁴³ T. XII. p. 626b.

⁵⁴⁴ *ibid.* p. 869a.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

The Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra*, *Daban niepan jing* (大般涅槃經, *Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra*), remarks that people run away from the person who is eating garlic because of the terrible smell, just as people run away from someone who has eaten meat, because of the terrible smell of meat and the fear of him eating meat.⁵⁴⁷ The issue of meat eating shall be dealt with in a later chapter.

Another Mahāyāna text which mentions garlic and pungent vegetables is the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (*Rulengga jing*, 楞伽經) which preaches the concept of the Buddha-Nature (*Tathāgatagarbha*, 如來藏):⁵⁴⁸

Mahāmati ! Thus, spring onions, chives, garlic and scallions are all filthy and impure and obstruct the holy path.

They also soil the pure places of the human and heavenly worlds. How could those be the products of the pure lands of Buddhas!⁵⁴⁹

This *sūtra* defines garlic and the other pungent vegetables as ‘filthy and impure’ and states, furthermore, that they prevent the fulfilment of religious ideals. These strong remarks are reminiscent of the position on garlic and its relatives in Hindu *dharmaśāstra*, one based on understandings of purity and impurity in relation to both the physical world and the caste system. According to Indologist Brian K. Smith, the definition of vegetables, and their acceptance or rejection reflects the hierarchy within social relationships as formalised in the Hindu *varṇa*/caste system.⁵⁵⁰ Our Mahāyāna texts accept this social hierarchy and use the response to certain vegetables to allocate Buddhist monastics a specific high-caste position in that hierarchy. We can see similar discriminative descriptions in the Mahāyāna *sūtra* not

⁵⁴⁶ T. XII. p. 626b.

⁵⁴⁷ *ibid.* p. 386b.

⁵⁴⁸ For this text, there are three Chinese translations: 1) the *Lengg abaduoluo baojing*, 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 (by Guṇabhadra, 求那跋陀羅 in 443), 2) the *Rulengga jing*, 入楞伽經 (by Bodhiruci, 菩提流支 in 513), 3) the *Dacheng rulengga jing*, 大乘入楞伽經 (by Śikṣānanda, 實叉難陀 in 704). I used the second of these.

⁵⁴⁹ T. XVI. p. 564a.

⁵⁵⁰ Smith 1994: 208-230.

only in relation to garlic and other pungent vegetables, but also in the development of prohibitions on meat-eating. The relationship between the concepts of physical impurity and caste can be seen in such texts through the repeated mention of the impurity and immorality of members of the *caṇḍāla* caste.⁵⁵¹

Another Mahāyāna text which deals fulsomely with the issue of garlic and pungent vegetables, this time in connection with meditation practice, is the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* (楞嚴經).⁵⁵² Volume 8 of this *sūtra* diagnoses that our minds, which were originally subtle, perfect, sincere, pure and clear, are now distorted and that we have mental defilement. It states that we should therefore remove the root cause of mental defilement through three gradual methods to cultivate and achieve the *samādhi* of the Buddha:⁵⁵³

A: Cultivation: to remove the causes which are the condition for the arising of mental defilements;

B: True cultivation: to bring out original mind;

C: Gradual approaching: to achieve enlightenment through gradual cultivation.⁵⁵⁴

Among these three stages, the first ‘A: Cultivation’ is called the stage of ‘the first gradual cultivation’ and is related to the consumption of food:

What is the cause which is the condition of mental defilement? Ananda!, thus, there are twelve groups of sentient beings in the world. They could not survive themselves, and they live on four kinds of foods, 1) material food, 2) food of contact, 3) food of volition, 4) food of consciousness. On this account, the Buddha preaches that all sentient beings depend and survive on food. Ananda! All sentient beings could live when they eat good food and die when they eat poisonous food. Therefore, all sentient beings who cultivate the *samādhi* should not eat the five kinds of pungent vegetable [such as garlic, onion, etc.] in the world.

⁵⁵¹ T. XVI. p. 561c; T. XVI. p. 623b.

⁵⁵² The full title of this sutra is the *Da foding rulai miyin xiuzheng liaoyi zhu pusa wanxing shoulengyan jing* (大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經), T. XIX p. 106b.

⁵⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 141b.

⁵⁵⁴ *ibid.*

These five kinds of pungent vegetable cause lust when eating them cooked, and anger when eating them raw. Even though people, who eat pungent vegetables, are versed in the preaching all kinds of Buddhist texts, all heavenly beings and sages would move far away, loathing filthy and smelly people; and all hungry ghosts go to him due to the food, and lick his lips; and he would be stuck with the hungry ghosts. For him merits are reduced daily and there are no benefits. Therefore, even though people who eat pungent vegetables do cultivate the *samādhi*, Bodhisattvas, heavenly beings, sages and beneficent *devas* in every direction do not come and protect him; and the king of evil who has great power disguises himself as the Buddha and preaches. He criticises and interrupts precepts and praises lust, anger and ignorance. When dying, he becomes one of family members of the king of evil for himself and when the merit of family members of the king of evil is exhausted, he falls into the hell where pains are endless. Ananda! One who seeks for enlightenment should not eat the five pungent vegetables. This is called the first stage which gradually improves cultivation.⁵⁵⁵

A commentary on the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* (楞嚴經), the *Lengyanjing jian* (楞嚴經箋), interprets the phrase ‘to eat good food’ as ‘to eat rice and millet and to not eat the five pungent vegetables’: ‘to eat food which is poisonous’ as ‘to eat grain-bugs or wild arrowroot or the five pungent vegetables.’⁵⁵⁶ Another commentary on the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, the *Shoulengyan yishuzhu jing* (首楞嚴義疏注經), explains that practitioners should not eat the five pungent vegetables because eating them is like poison which kills the Dharma-body, as they have a hot property and are smelly and spicy.⁵⁵⁷ Yet another commentary on the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, the *Leng yan jing quan she* (楞嚴經貫攝), states that even though the five pungent vegetables are not poisons, they are more poisonous than poison, and therefore one who cultivates the *samādhi* should abstain from consuming them.⁵⁵⁸

⁵⁵⁵ T. XIX. p. 141c.

⁵⁵⁶ X. XI p. 1057a.

⁵⁵⁷ T. XXXIX p. 925b.

⁵⁵⁸ X. XV. p. 491b.

The reason why the five pungent vegetables are defined in these texts as poison is because they are connected with causing lust and anger. In this vein, another commentary on the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, the *Shou leng yan jing ji jie xun wen ji* (首楞嚴經集解熏聞記) remarks that “the five pungent vegetables are the basis for the arising of lust and anger and therefore, [we] should abstain from consuming the five pungent vegetables.”⁵⁵⁹

To sum up what we have examined so far, it seems that the earliest prohibitions on garlic in the *vinaya* seem to relate principally to potential over-demand, in this case, for example, the immoderation of nuns in taking garlic for use during a festival, and secondarily to the unpleasant effect on others caused by its smell. What we find later, however, is the acceptance of the association between impurity of certain foodstuffs and personal purity, as found in the Hindu *dharmaśāstra*. This develops into statements that such foods not only repulse others but hinder spiritual progress.

In his study of Buddhist attitudes to plants, Lambert Schmithausen explores the relationship between Buddhist attitudes and those of other religious traditions found in the same social context. In relation to garlic he firstly looks at the possibility that garlic is seen as a sentient being. He notes that this belief was held by Jains, among others, who thought that “any bulbs, bulbous roots or other pieces of plants (like sugar-cane) are capable of sprouting as long as they are not fully deprived of life by means of cutting and cooking. This holds, of course, good also for garlic.”⁵⁶⁰ However, in Buddhist texts, there is no explicit statement that vegetables are living beings. Based on this, Schmithausen concludes that Buddhism – in contrast to Jainism – does not consider garlic to be a sentient being.⁵⁶¹ Secondly, Schmithausen looks at

⁵⁵⁹ X. XI p. 759c.

⁵⁶⁰ Schmithausen 1991b: 44.

⁵⁶¹ *ibid*: 44.

those introductory stories in Buddhist *vinaya* that we have examined above. As we have noted, the stories do not match the rule well and Schmithausen observes:

The story adduces the case of nuns who, being offered, or allowed to collect, garlic, misbehaved by taking too much or spoiling the rest, thereby impairing or even ruining the owner. But, as has already been noted by Waldschmidt, this explanation does not at all fit in with the precept itself.⁵⁶²

Consequently, he notes that one property attributed to garlic is that it is an aphrodisiac, citing a remark by lay people in the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, “Nuns eat garlic like lay women.”⁵⁶³ Even though the background stories of Buddhist *vinaya* mentioned above do not explicitly confirm this, he suggests,

Perhaps the real reason for this is that garlic is considered to be sexually stimulating; and since it is a truism in the Indian ascetic tradition that women are by nature particularly inclined to lasciviousness, this reason would best explain why in the *Pātimokkhasutta* eating garlic is prohibited for nuns only.⁵⁶⁴

The understanding that garlic is an aphrodisiac was widespread in ancient societies, including India, Greece and Rome. In India, “onions as well as garlic are believed to stimulate the sexual appetite.” Even in modern Indian society, people think that garlic, onion, meat, and alcoholic beverages arouse one sexually.⁵⁶⁵ Even though there is no explicit mention of this in the Buddhist *pācittiya* background stories, the nuns who eat garlic are equated with lay women, and Schmithausen’s interpretation seems to be confirmed by the later association between garlic and lust in the Mahāyāna *sūtra* and their commentaries which we examined above.⁵⁶⁶

Ann Heirman has also expressed doubt about the background stories. Regarding the explanation that the nuns caused economic harm to their lay

⁵⁶² *ibid*: 45.

⁵⁶³ T. XXIII. p. 317b.

⁵⁶⁴ Schmithausen 1991b: 46.

⁵⁶⁵ Simoons 1998: 149.

⁵⁶⁶ T. XIX. p. 141c.

supporters, she writes, “This explanation is somehow strange, since it could just as well be applied to every product nuns like to eat.”⁵⁶⁷ She is inclined to think that “The main reason for this restriction [on garlic] is because of the bad smell spread by its consumers, much to the annoyance of fellow monks and lay followers.”⁵⁶⁸ However, this does not explain why it should be more serious for nuns to eat garlic than monks. I shall return to this point later, after looking at other ‘unshared’ or additional food rules for nuns.

4-1-2. The *bhikkhunī pācittiya* rule 7 on raw grains.

“Should any nun, having requested raw grain or having had it requested, having roasted it or having had it roasted, having pounded it or having had it pounded, having cooked it or having had it cooked, then eat it, it is to be confessed.”⁵⁶⁹

The Pali *bhikkhunī pācittiya* rule number 7, given above, concerns raw grains.

The background story of this rule in the *Suttavibhaṅga* of the Pali *vinaya* is as follows:

At Sāvattihī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada’s monastery. Now at that time nuns, having had raw grain asked for at harvest time, carried it towards the town. (Those) at the gateway, saying: “Ladies, give a portion,” having obstructed (them) let (them) go. Then these nuns, having gone to a dwelling, told this matter to the nuns. Those who were modest nuns... spread it about saying: “How can these nuns have raw grain asked for?” ...The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, saying: “How monks, can nuns have raw grain asked for?”⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁷ Heirmann, et. al. 2006: 62.

⁵⁶⁸ *ibid*: 61.

⁵⁶⁹ Vin. IV. p.264. Yā pana bhikkhunī āmakadaññaṃ vinnitvā vā viññāpetvā vā bhajjitvā vā bhajjāpetvā vā koṭṭitvā vā koṭṭāpetvā vā pacitvā vā pacāpetvā vā bhuñjeyya pācittiyaṃ. (This translation is from Thanissaro 2007 at <http://www.accesstinsight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhuni-pati.html#pc-part1> visited on 1st July 2015. Vin. I. p.210.) *Bhikkhu* are also not allowed to accept raw grains; if a monk violates this rule, he commits a *dukkata* offence.

⁵⁷⁰ Translation Horner 1993: 255.

This explanation is somewhat brief, although the *Suttavibhaṅga* goes on to specify that raw grains may be rice, paddy, barley, wheat, millet, beans, or rye.⁵⁷¹ A more detailed reason is given in the background story to Dharmaguptaka *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 76, the equivalent rule:

The Blessed One stayed at Sāvattihī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's monastery. Now at that time, the group of six nuns begged for raw grains such as sesame, rice, big and small beans and big and small barley. On seeing this, lay people laughed at them and reviled them. They criticised the begging by the nuns as showing lack of contentment and shamelessness, saying ... "They are not different from lascivious and wicked lay women."⁵⁷²

The criticism in this story suggests that it is inappropriate to obtain raw grains because it is connected with gluttony (lack of contentment) and lust (lasciviousness), although the connection between the activity and the criticism is again unclear.

Scholars Hirakawa Akira and Lambert Schmithausen have both looked at this rule and understood it in terms of *ahiṃsā* 'avoiding harming' in relation to seeds. Hirakawa, writing about *vinaya* rules, briefly mentions that the motive of this rule is related to grains having life, and so being regarded as sentient beings. In an article which deals with the topic of the sentience of plants, Schmithausen analyses the reason for this *pācittiya* rule:

This would seem to suggest that the primary motive is, in both cases [of *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhunī*], rather the fact that in order to use raw grain (i.e. seeds capable of germination) for food, the monk or nun has to destroy them by roasting, etc., and that this was regarded as an act of killing a living, sentient being.⁵⁷³

A rule concerning the sentience of plants is also seen in *bhikkhu pācittiya* 11 in the Theravāda *vinaya*.⁵⁷⁴ In the *Mahāsāṃghika* minor rules, accepting raw meat is excluded

⁵⁷¹ Vin. IV. p. 264.

⁵⁷² T. XXII. p. 739a. Author's translation.

⁵⁷³ Schmithausen 1991b: 40-41.

⁵⁷⁴ Vin. IV. p.34.

but, accepting raw meat and raw grain is banned following criticism from lay people.⁵⁷⁵

Schmithausen notes the association with the adjective ‘raw (*āma*)’ and the act of killing, such that raw meat (*āmaka-māṃsa*) is associated with causing injury or harm, and so breaking the ethos of *ahiṃsā*, non-harming.⁵⁷⁶ Elsewhere, Seyfort Ruegg deals with the ‘smell of flesh (*āmagandha*)’ and makes a connection between the expression, *āmagandha*, and ethical meanings such as “stealing, falsehood, deception, adultery, lasciviousness, nihilism, etc.” in the figurative and metaphorical senses.⁵⁷⁷

In relation to raw grains, Schmithausen notes that there is a difference of perspective between the *Pāṭimokkha* and the *Sutta Piṭaka*:

The *Pāṭimokkha* rule prohibits begging (*viññatti*) for raw grain, whereas according to the *Suttapiṭaka* passage even acceptance (*paṭiggahaṇa*), which doubtless includes acceptance even of spontaneously given raw grain, has to be abandoned. Hence, the *Suttapiṭaka* rule is obviously the stricter one.⁵⁷⁸

Schmithausen goes on to suggest that the attitude of the *Suttapiṭaka* in prohibiting the acceptance of raw grains is “more archaic, perhaps adopted from some pre-existing, non-Buddhist codex of ascetic behaviour.”⁵⁷⁹ The sentience of seed, like the sentience of bulbs discussed above, is dealt with significantly in Jainism. The Jaina text, the *Ācarāṅga Sūtra* (the first book dated to the 5-4th century B.C. and the second book to the 2-1st century BCE) states:

A monk or a nun on a begging-tour should not accept raw rice (*āmadāga*), dregs, honey, liquor, ghee, or sediments of liquor, if these things be old or if living beings are engendered or grow or thrive in them, or are not taken out, or killed or destroyed in them.⁵⁸⁰

⁵⁷⁵ Schmithausen 1991b: 41. Footnote. 232; T. XXII. p. 478a.

⁵⁷⁶ Schmithausen 1991b: 41.

⁵⁷⁷ Seyfort Ruegg 1980: 240.

⁵⁷⁸ Schmithausen 1991b: 42.

⁵⁷⁹ *ibid*: 42.

⁵⁸⁰ Jacobi 1884: 109-110.

A monk or a nun on a begging-tour should not accept such raw, unmodified substances as corn, clumps of corn, cakes of corn, sesamum, ground sesamum, or cakes of sesamum.⁵⁸¹

The attitude to raw grain or seed in Jainism derives from the Jain view that raw grain and seed and the other items lists either are sentient beings or contain sentient beings which can be killed or destroyed. This Jaina text also prohibits the acceptance of raw grains, the same prohibition found for Buddhist monks and nuns. Yet while it fits doctrinally with Jain beliefs, it does not fit with Buddhist beliefs regarding sentient life.

In Jainism, seeds and plants are explicitly identified as sentient beings.⁵⁸² Jainism classifies plants as sentient beings, among nine types of sentient being, with a single sense organ.

1. sentient beings with one sense organ (*ekendriya pṛthvī-kāya*, the earth)
2. sentient beings with one sense organ (*ekendriya ap-kāya*, the water)
3. sentient beings with one sense organ (*ekendriya tejah kāya*, the fire)
4. sentient beings with one sense organ (*ekendriya vayu kāya*, the wind)
5. sentient beings with one sense organ (*ekendriya vanaspati kāya*, plants)
6. sentient beings with two sense organs (*dvindriya*, with touch and taste, microbes, worms, etc.)
7. sentient beings with three sense organs (*trīndriya*, with touch, taste and smell, bugs, moth, etc.)
8. sentient beings with four sense organs (*caturindriya*, with touch, taste, smell and sight, scorpions, spiders, etc.)
9. sentient beings with five sense organs (*pañcendriya*, with touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing, human beings, cow, fish and birds, etc.).⁵⁸³

⁵⁸¹ *ibid*: 110.

⁵⁸² Āyārs. p. 4.26-31; p.41-4 cited from Schmithausen 1991b: 3.

⁵⁸³ Williams 1963: 33.

In contrast, Buddhism is less inclusive when it comes to defining living beings. Its cosmology includes five realms of existence which give five categories of sentient beings: hell-beings, hungry ghosts, animals, humans, and gods, and sometimes a sixth group, the anti-gods.⁵⁸⁴ Another Buddhist classification of sentient beings is according to the means by which they are born: womb-born (*jarāyu-ja*); egg-born (*aṇḍa-ja*); moisture-born (*saṃseda-ja*); spontaneously born (*opapātika*).⁵⁸⁵ This classification focuses on animals as the sentient beings. Even though these two classifications of sentient beings do not include seeds and plants, the Buddhist *Suttapiṭaka* says the monastics should abstain from killing and harming seeds and plants⁵⁸⁶; while the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, only mentions plants.⁵⁸⁷ This may relate to accommodating lay views, for in the Pali *vinaya* there are instances in which lay people express the view that plants are sentient beings.⁵⁸⁸ An example which shows how Buddhism does not consider plants to be sentient beings is the rule against defecating on plants. This is a *sekhiya* ‘training’ offence for monks and a *pācittiya* rule for nuns.⁵⁸⁹

Unlike the Pali and the Dharmaguptaka *bhikkhunī pācittiya* rules on raw grains, the Mahīśāsaka *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 163, which is equivalent to the Pali *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 1, has a background story which focuses on cooking (boiling):

At that time, nuns boiled raw foodstuffs and prepared food. The laity rebuked them, “Having boiled raw foodstuffs and prepared food for themselves, how could they beg for alms from other people for themselves? They do not practise the virtues of religious practitioners and abandon the path for religious practitioners. ... If a nun boils raw foodstuffs and prepares food for herself, it should be confessed.”⁵⁹⁰

⁵⁸⁴ DN. III. p. 234; MN. I. p. 73; AN. IV. p. 459.

⁵⁸⁵ DN. III. p. 230; MN. I. p. 73.

⁵⁸⁶ T. I. p. 83c; 89a; 264c; 273a; 657b; 733b cited from Schmithausen 1991b: 8.

⁵⁸⁷ Schmithausen 1991b: 10.

⁵⁸⁸ *ibid*: 31.

⁵⁸⁹ *ibid*: 33.

⁵⁹⁰ T. XXII. p. 96c. Author’s translation.

The Sarvāstivāda *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 76, which is equivalent to the Pali *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 1, also has a story on cooking by two nuns:

The Buddha stayed in Sāvattihī. At that time, there were two nuns, Luo zha (羅吒) and Boluozha (波羅吒). They were from distinguished families. These two nuns got up early in the morning, went to the house of an intimate lay person, obtained palatable food and ate it, but the taste was poor. [the nuns] asked, “Who made this?” the householder said, “My cook prepared the [food].”

The nuns said, “How could you make this poor tasting food?” The householder asked, “Can you make [delicious food]?” The nuns said, “We can, if you want to prepare food for the festival at the river on an auspicious day, come as soon as you can and inform us. We will prepare food for you.” Later on, when the householder wanted to go to the park on an auspicious day, he called in the nuns. These nuns came and prepared food. There was a guest cook who came to the kitchen to help cooking and saw the cooked food. He came out [from the kitchen] and asked, “Who cooked this food?” The household answered, “there were two nuns, Luo zha (羅吒) and Boluozha. They cooked this food.” The guest cook, getting angry, said, “These nuns have not followed the correct behaviour of nuns. They took away my job.”

... If a nun boils raw foodstuff and prepares food, it should be confessed.⁵⁹¹

The Mūlasarvāstivāda *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 77, which is equivalent to the Pali *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 1, also has a story in which nuns prepare sweets made of animal fat, milk products and various cakes.⁵⁹² Schmithausen suggests that the reason we have these rules for nuns and not monks relates to the traditional role of women before becoming nuns:

The reason suggesting itself is that for a nun the temptation to ask for raw grain in order to prepare a delicious dish was much greater, since cooking was, of course, a typically female activity.⁵⁹³

⁵⁹¹ T. XXIII. p. 318 a-b. The *Mahāsāṃghika bhikkhunī pācittiya* on raw grain also prohibits cooking. T. XXII. p. 530a.

⁵⁹² T. XXIII. p. 998b.

⁵⁹³ Schmithausen 1991b: 42.

Let us look further at the relationship between cooking and women. Of the role of women in cooking in medieval Europe, historian Caroline Walker Bynum states, “Cooking was so much a woman’s role that it appeared, to men, not merely arcane but threatening.”⁵⁹⁴ She continues, “When medieval men projected their hostility toward women into suspicion of what went on in the women’s quarters, they frequently spoke of women’s control of food.”⁵⁹⁵ Bynum further remarks on the role of cooking and the meaning of food to women: “To prepare food is to control food. Moreover, food is not merely a resource that women control; it is the resource that women control, both for themselves and for others.”⁵⁹⁶ According to her, cooking and food are, for women, means of threatening and controlling. A similar analysis of ancient Indian attitudes could shed light on why it is that Buddhist nuns’ relationship to food is more tightly controlled than that of monks. Patrick Olivelle defines the four activities in relation to food which constitute ‘food effort’⁵⁹⁷ and which renunciants in ancient India variously sought to reject: “production or procurement, storage, preparation, and consumption.”⁵⁹⁸ The cooking aspect of food preparation is an aspect that differs between different types of renouncer. The brahminical Hindu *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* classifies ascetics into two groups: those who do cook and those who don’t, and then further subdivides these into the type of food they cook.⁵⁹⁹

1. Ascetics who cook

- a. *Sarvāranyaka*: eating all forest produce. The *Sarvāranyaka* are of two types, using two kinds of forest produce. They are the *Indrāvasiktas*—those who use plants produced by rain;

⁵⁹⁴ Bynum 1987: 190.

⁵⁹⁵ *ibid*: 190.

⁵⁹⁶ *ibid*: 191.

⁵⁹⁷ This is the expression coined by Olivelle and includes the activities of production, storage, preparation and consumption by people in a society. 1987: 27.

⁵⁹⁸ Olivelle 1987: 27-28.

⁵⁹⁹ Shiraishi 1996: 44.

and the *Retovasiktas*—those who use animals produced from semen. Of these, the *Indrāvasiktas* collect the produce of vines, shrubs, creepers and trees; cook it; offer the daily fire sacrifice with it morning and evening; give portions of it to ascetics, guests, and students; and eat what remains. The *Retovasiktas* collect the flesh of animals killed by tigers, wolves, hawks, or other predators; cook it; offer the daily fire sacrifice with it morning and evening; give portions of it to ascetics, guests, and students; and eat what remains.

b. *Vaiṭuṣika*: eating only husked grain. Avoiding grains, collect husked rice kernels; cook it; offer the daily fire sacrifice with it morning and evening; give portions of it to ascetics, guests, and students; and eat what remains.

c. *Kandamūlabhākṣa*: eating only bulbs and roots.

d. *Phalabhākṣa*: eating only fruits.

e. *Śākabhākṣa*: eating only leafy vegetables.

2. Ascetics who do not cook

a. *Unmajjakas*: the submerged. *Unmajjakas* avoid using iron and stone implements.

b. *Pravṛttāśins*: eating what is found. The *Pravṛttāśins* take food in their hands.

c. *Mukhenādāyins*: taking with the mouth. The *Mukhenādāyins* take food with their mouths.

d. *Toyāhāras*: subsisting on water

e. *Vāyubhākṣas*: subsisting on air. The *Vāyubhākṣas* do not eat at all.⁶⁰⁰

In previous studies, the examination of *bhikkhunī pācittiya* 7 has focused on the sentience of raw grain as a potential reason lurking in the background from an earlier stage or form of asceticism.⁶⁰¹ However, while sometimes seeming to accommodate lay views on the sentience of plants, Buddhism does not share this view of grain as sentient. Rather, as we saw in chapter 2, for Buddhist monastics it was the avoidance of food preparation that was key, rather than the avoidance of food *per se*. Therefore it seems likely to me that the issue here concerns women's traditional roles as the ones who cook, and it is this that these rules are really about. It may be that the aim is to

⁶⁰⁰ BDh. 3.3.3-14. Translation Olivelle 1999: 214.

⁶⁰¹ See the studies by Schmithausen 1991b: 40; Hirakawa 1998: 444.

prevent nuns from retaining the habits of preparing and cooking food that they developed as lay women, and to make clear that this was not expected of them. Now the are renunciators, it is inappropriate for them to cook, as confirmed by the lay reactions in the background stories. This is a possible reason why it became an additional rule only for nuns, and not for monks, i.e. because monks were not at the same risk, cooking not being expected behaviour for men. Therefore, when we explore the motive behind *pācittiya* rule 7, we should consider the significance of cooking to renunciators including *bhikkhunī*.

4-2. The *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* rules on eight sumptuous foodstuffs

There are just eight rules in the *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* section of the Pali *vinaya*. They are all ‘unshared’, i.e. do not apply to monks, and they all relate to sumptuous foodstuffs. These sumptuous food items are very similar to, but not exactly the same as, the food items listed in the 39th *bhikkhu pācittiya* rule, which is an unshared rule with no parallel *bhikkhunī pācittiya* in the Pali *vinaya*.

The entirety of the Pāli *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* consists of regulations specifying eight kinds of luxury food items that nuns should not beg for, for their own use; each of the eight items constitutes a separate rule. The Pāli *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* rules prohibit these food items:

- A. 1st rule: nuns should not beg for ghee (*sappi*) for their own use.⁶⁰²
- B. 2nd rule: nuns should not beg for oil (*tela*) for their own use.⁶⁰³
- C. 3rd rule: nuns should not beg for honey (*madhu*) for their own use.⁶⁰⁴
- D. 4th rule: nuns should not beg for molasses (*phāṇita*) for their own use.⁶⁰⁵

⁶⁰² Vin. iv. p. 347. Yā pana bhikkhunī agilānā macchaṃ viññāpetvā bhuñjeyya pāṭidesetabbaṃ.

⁶⁰³ *Ibid.* ... telaṃ ...

⁶⁰⁴ *Ibid.* ... madhuṃ ...

⁶⁰⁵ *Ibid.* ...phāṇitaṃ ...

E. 5th rule: nuns should not beg for fish (*maccha*) for their own use.⁶⁰⁶

F. 6th rule: nuns should not beg for meat (*maṃsa*) for their own use.⁶⁰⁷

G. 7th rule: nuns should not beg for milk (*khīra*) for their own use.⁶⁰⁸

H. 8th rule: nuns should not beg for curd (*dadhi*) for their own use.⁶⁰⁹

The Pali vinaya text narrates the story of the establishment of the Pali *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* rules as follows:

At that time the enlightened one, the lord, was staying at Sāvattthī in the Jeta Grove in Anāthapiṇḍika's monastery. Now at that time the group of six nuns, having had ghee asked for, partook of it. People...spread it about, saying: "How can these nuns, having had ghee asked for, partake of it? Who does not like well cooked things? Who does not like sweet things?" ...The enlightened one, the lord, rebuked them, ... Whatever nun, having had ghee asked for, should partake of it, it should be confessed by that nun...⁶¹⁰

In the Pali *vinaya*, the individual stories for the other seven luxury foodstuffs are very similar so I shall not repeat them all here. Rather I shall turn straightaway to the parallel stories in the other main *vinaya*, concerning ghee.

In the narrative of the establishment of the Dharmaguptaka *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* rules, the group of six nuns beg for ghee. Lay followers criticize them, saying that they are no different from thieves and prostitutes, but no specific reason beyond their lack of modest contentment is given.⁶¹¹

The Mahīśāsaka story is more explicit. There the nuns beg for ghee because they want to eat it. Lay people think that ghee is a luxury food which people naturally wish to eat. They criticize the nuns for not focusing on the purport of their religious teaching, rather than being attached to delicious food. Furthermore, the lay people

⁶⁰⁶ *Ibid.* ... macchaṃ ...

⁶⁰⁷ *Ibid.* ... mamsaṃ ...

⁶⁰⁸ *Ibid.* ... khīraṃ ...

⁶⁰⁹ *Ibid.* ... dadhiṃ ...

⁶¹⁰ Horner 1993: p. 346.

⁶¹¹ T. XXII. p. 778a.

think that the nuns are after the food in order to develop attractive complexions, a motivation they also attribute to prostitutes in seeking out ghee.⁶¹²

In the Mahāsāṃghika story, the group of six nuns eat each of the luxury foodstuffs after begging at different specialist markets: for ghee at the ghee market, for oil at the oil market, for honey at the honey market, for molasses at the molasses market, for meat at the meat market, for fish at the fish market, for milk at the milk market and for curd at the curd market. Lay people ridiculed their highly specialise begging habits.⁶¹³

In the Sarvāstivāda narrative some nuns, followers of Devadatta, refuse to eat a milk-based soup cooked with a medical herb. When the donor, Mahānāma, asked why, one of the nuns replied that she would eat only when curd, butter, cheese, oil, fish, meat and jerky were provided, i.e. she would only eat luxurious foods.⁶¹⁴

The *bhikkhuni pāṭidesaniyā* rules mentioned above state that begging for these foodstuffs has been prohibited because they are luxury food items, foodstuffs which people enjoy, delicious food items, and that is why those foodstuffs are not suitable for renunciators. However, it seems that there should be more substantive explanations of the establishment of this set of *pāṭidesaniyā* rules for nuns.

The Buddhist *vinaya* also contains a very similar rule which only applies to monks: Pali *pācittiya* 39 (see chapter 3) for monks already prohibits begging for luxury food items.⁶¹⁵ So why does the Pali *vinaya* have *pāṭidesaniyā* rules for nuns that overlap with Pali *pācittiya* 39, and apply them only to nuns? In order to answer this question, we should look at the attitude of the Pali *vinaya* towards lust and look at how this

⁶¹² T. XXII. p. 100a.

⁶¹³ T. XXII. p. 544a.

⁶¹⁴ T. XXIII. p. 345b. *The Travel Record* written by Chinese monk, Xuanzang (the *Datang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記) mentions that there were monks who followed the teaching of Devadatta, in which milk and curd were prohibited (T. LI. p. 928a).

⁶¹⁵ Vin. IV. p. 88.

attitude differs in relation to *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhunī*. The Pali *bhikkhu pārājika* section consists of 4 kinds of rules; the Pali *bhikkhunī pārājika* section consists of eight rules. The nuns have four additional *pārājika* rules of which two, the fifth and the eighth, relate to lust:

5. Should any nun, lusting, consent to a lusting man's rubbing, rubbing up against, taking hold of, touching, or fondling (her) below the collar-bone and above the circle of the knees, she also is defeated and no longer in affiliation for being "one above the circle of the knees."

8. Should any nun, lusting, consent to a lusting man's taking hold of her hand or touching the edge of her outer robe, or should she stand with him or converse with him or go to a rendezvous with him, or should she consent to his approaching her, or should she enter a hidden place with him, or should she dispose her body to him — (any of these) for the purpose of that unrighteous act (Comm: physical contact) — then she also is defeated and no longer in affiliation for "(any of) eight grounds."⁶¹⁶

The content of the *bhikkhunī pārājika* 5 is remarkably similar to the second of the 13 rules of the Pali *bhikkhu saṅghādisesa*, the section of rules which are a degree of seriousness lower.

2. Should any *bhikkhu*, overcome by lust, with altered mind, engage in bodily contact with a woman, or in holding her hand, holding a lock of her hair, or caressing any of her limbs, it entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.⁶¹⁷

Including this second rule, four of the Pali *bhikkhu saṅghādisesa*'s 13 rules relate to lust: the 1st, the 2nd, the 3rd and the 4th.⁶¹⁸ Except for the first rule of the Pali *pārājika*, which

⁶¹⁶ Translation from Thanissaro 2007 *Bhikkhunī Pāṭimokkha (The Bhikkhunīs' Code of Discipline)* at <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhuni-pati.html#pr> visited on 15th July 2015.

⁶¹⁷ Translation from Thanissaro 2007 *Bhikkhu Pāṭimokkha (The Bhikkhus' Code of Discipline)* at <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#sg-2> visited on 15th July 2015.

⁶¹⁸ 1. Intentional emission of semen, except while dreaming, entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

2. Should any *bhikkhu*, overcome by lust, with altered mind, engage in bodily contact with a woman, or in holding her hand, holding a lock of her hair, or caressing any of her limbs, it entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

3. Should any *bhikkhu*, overcome by lust, with altered mind, address lewd words to a woman in the manner of young men to a young woman alluding to sexual intercourse, it entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

deals with sexual intercourse, the most serious sexual offences for *bhikkhus* are dealt with in the less important *saṅghādisesa* rules. For nuns, however, the offences related to sexual misconduct beyond the first *pārājika* rule are also dealt with in the *pārājika* rules (the fifth and the eighth). The consequence for a nun committing any of these offences is expulsion from the Sangha.

Thus offences with same content (the *bhikkhunī pārājika* 5 and the *bhikkhu saṅghādisesa* 2) are punished with different levels of gravity. In the cases of the nuns' *saṅghādisesa* (the 5th and the 6th, see above) which are related to receiving food from men, nuns are to be more severely punished compared to the requirements for the violation of the monks *saṅghādisesa*.⁶¹⁹ These two *bhikkhunī saṅghādisesa* rules (the 5th and the 6th) also are the rules among the Pali *pāṭimokkha* rules relating to food which prescribe the most severe punishments.

As we saw earlier, the Pali *pācittiya* has different numbers of rules for monks and nuns. Among the 92 rules of the *bhikkhu pācittiya*, 22 rules are not shared with nuns' rules. Among these 22 rules, the 39th rule, which prohibits the begging for nine sumptuous food items, is a rule unshared with the *bhikkhunī pācittiya*. This means that the Pali nun *pācittiya* section does not include the rule which prohibits begging for sumptuous food items. Instead the nuns have eight *pāṭidesanīya* rules, one for each foodstuff. Does the presence of the prohibition of begging for luxury foodstuffs in the *bhikkhunī pāṭidesanīya* rules mean that the monks' equivalent rule (the *pācittiya* 39th rule) is more strict than those for nuns? And is there any difference between the

4. Should any *bhikkhu*, overcome by lust, with altered mind, speak in the presence of a woman in praise of ministering to his own sensuality thus: "This, sister, is the foremost ministration, that of ministering to a virtuous, fine-natured follower of the celibate life such as myself with this act" — alluding to sexual intercourse — it entails initial and subsequent meetings of the Community.

Translation from Thanissaro 2007 *Bhikkhu Pāṭimokkha* (*The Bhikkhus' Code of Discipline*) at

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#sg-2> visited on 15th July 2015.

⁶¹⁹ Vin. IV. pp. 233-234.

pāṭidesanīya and the *pācittiya* in terms of the severity of the punishment as there is between the *pārājika* and the *saṅghādisesa*?

The three rules, the *pācittiya*, the *pāṭidesanīya* and the *sekhiya* all impose light penalties on the offender, and it does not seem that the severity of the punishment is a significant factor in these cases of those three rules. The eight luxury foodstuffs in the *pāṭidesanīya* are established not as one of many rules, but as a separate section of the *pāṭimokkha*.

To sum up, the Pali *pāṭimokkha* discriminates between monks and nuns in a variety of ways. Discrimination in the regulation of behaviour related to food, gluttony, sexual behaviour and lust is more conspicuous than that in other areas:

A. The same level of offence but a different punishment: the nun *pārājika* the 5th and 8th vs. the monk *saṅghādisesa* the 2nd. The nun *pācittiya* rule on garlic and raw grain vs. the monk *dukkata* offences on garlic and raw grain (See the earlier sections of this chapter).

B. The different level of offence but the same level of punishment: The nun *saṅghādisesa* the 5th and 6th on receiving food from a man who has lust for her vs. the monk *saṅghādisesa* 2nd on bodily contact with a woman.

C. The reduction in offence and the enlargement of offence: one of many rules (*pācittiya* 39) for the monks, but for nuns a separate section of the *pāṭimokkha* (the eight *bhikkhunī pāṭidesanīya* rules).

The following table shows the foodstuffs of the five major Buddhist *vinaya*:

Pāli	Dharmaguptaka	Mahīśāsaka	Mahāsāṃghika	Sarvāstivāda
1. Ghee (sappi)	1. Ghee (酥)	1. Ghee (酥)	1. Ghee (酥)	1. Ghee (熟酥)
2. Oil (tela)	2. Oil (油)	2. Oil (油)	2. Oil (油)	2. Oil (油)
3. Curd (dadhi)	3. Curd (酪)	3. Curd (酪)	3. Curd (酪)	3. Curd (酪)
4. Milk (khīra)	4. Milk (乳)	4. Milk (乳)	4. Milk (乳)	4. Milk (乳)
5. Fish (maccha)	5. Fish (魚)	5. Fish (魚)	5. Fish (魚)	5. Fish (魚)
6. Meat (maṃsa)	6. Meat (肉)	6. Meat (肉)	6. Meat (肉)	6. Meat (肉)
7. Molasses (phāṇita)	7. Black molasses (黑石蜜)	7. Molasses (石蜜)	7. Molasses (石蜜)	7. Butter (生酥)
8. Honey (madhu) ⁶²⁰	8. Honey (蜜) ⁶²¹	8. Honey (蜜) ⁶²²	8. Honey (蜜) ⁶²³	8. Jerky (脯) ⁶²⁴

⁶²⁰ Vin. IV. p. 347.

Table 4.5. A comparison of the sumptuous food items in the nun *pāṭidesaniyā* rules of five major *vinaya* schools⁶²⁵

The *Suttavibhaṅga* in the Pali *vinaya* defines the eight foodstuffs as follows:

- A. Ghee (*sappi*) : ghee from cows, goats, buffaloes and the animals whose meat is used as food.⁶²⁶
- B. Oil: sesamum oil, mustard seed oil, oil containing honey, oil of castor-oil plant and animal oil.⁶²⁷
- C. Honey: honey of bees.⁶²⁸
- D. Molasses: as produced from sugar cane.⁶²⁹
- E. Fish: those that live in water.⁶³⁰
- F. Meat: the meat of those animals whose meat is permitted.⁶³¹
- G. Milk: milk of cows, goats, buffaloes and those whose meat is permitted.⁶³²
- H. Curd: curds of cows, goats, buffaloes and those whose meat is permitted.⁶³³

This list of eight kinds of food items is very similar to that of the foodstuffs which are defined as the nine ‘gastronomic foodstuffs’ in the Pali *pācittiya* 39 (see chapter 3. Table 3.4). There is only one food item different between the eight Pali *bhikkhunī* *pāṭidesaniyā* rules and the nine gastronomic foodstuffs in the Pali *bhikkhu* *pācittiya* 39. The latter includes an additional luxury food item, butter (*navanīta*)⁶³⁴, which is not found in the Pali *bhikkhunī* *pāṭidesaniyā* rules.

⁶²¹ T. XXII. p. 1038c.

⁶²² *Ibid.* p. 212c.

⁶²³ *Ibid.* p. 563b.

⁶²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 486b.

⁶²⁵ The order of the food items in each list is changed for the convenience of comparison.

⁶²⁶ Vin. IV. p. 347.

⁶²⁷ *Ibid.* p. 348.

⁶²⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶³⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶³¹ *Ibid.*

⁶³² *Ibid.*

⁶³³ *Ibid.*

⁶³⁴ *Ibid.* p. 88.

By contrast, the Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* rule on the gastronomic foodstuffs has only four items, milk, curd, fish and meat.⁶³⁵ This means that in the Dharmaguptaka *pācittiya* rule on the prohibition of begging for gastronomic foodstuffs for their own use, there are four food items, ghee, oil, honey and black molasses, for which the *bhikkhus* could beg, but the nuns could not. In the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* nuns have two more foodstuffs than monks, honey and molasses, for which they are prohibited from begging. The differences between the eight *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* rules and the *bhikkhu pācittiya* rules on the prohibition of begging for gastronomic foodstuffs in five major Buddhist *vinaya* are as follows:

A. The Pali *vinaya*

<i>bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā</i>	1.ghee	2. oil	3.curd	4.milk	5.fish	6.meat	7.molasses	8.honey	
<i>bhikkhu pācittiya</i>	1.ghee	2. oil	3.curd	4.milk	5.fish	6.meat	7.molasses	8.honey	9.butter ⁶³⁶

B. The Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*

<i>bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee	7.honey	8.black molasses
<i>bhikkhu pācittiya</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat ⁶³⁷				

C. The Mahīśāsaka *vinaya*

⁶³⁵ T. XXII. p. 664b.

⁶³⁶ V. IV. p. 88.

⁶³⁷ T. XXII. p. 664b.

<i>bhikkhunī</i> <i>pāṭidesaniyā</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee	7.honey	8.molasses
<i>bhikkhu</i> <i>pācittiya</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee ⁶³⁸		

D. The Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*

<i>bhikkhunī</i> <i>pāṭidesaniyā</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee	7.honey	8.molasses
<i>bhikkhu</i> <i>pācittiya</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee	7.honey	8.molasses ⁶³⁹

E. The Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*

<i>bhikkhunī</i> <i>pāṭidesaniyā</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee	7.butter	8.jerky
<i>bhikkhu</i> <i>pācittiya</i>	1.milk	2.curd	3.fish	4.meat	5.oil	6.ghee	7.butter	8.jerky ⁶⁴⁰

Table 4.6. Gastronomic foodstuffs in five *vinaya*.

As we have seen in the tables above, it seems that the *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* section has a different effect in the different *vinayas*. In one group, the section replaces the single *bhikkhu pācittiya* rule, and the prohibitions apply to almost the same list of luxury foodstuffs. The Pali, Mahāsāṃghika and Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* in particular follow this pattern. In the second group, the section has a more discriminatory effect because the list of luxury food items monks are prohibited from

⁶³⁸ T. XXII, p. 55b.

⁶³⁹ *ibid.* p. 361c.

⁶⁴⁰ T. XXIII, p. 97a.

begging for is shorter. The Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* exemplify this group.

4-3 Conclusion

To sum up, the nuns' unshared rules relating to food seem to have two characteristics. The first is discrimination against nuns, or rather a particular emphasis on the need for nuns to restrain their relationship to food, just as we see in the case of rules relating to lust. The second characteristic is that the unshared *bhikkhunī* rules replace equivalent *bhikkhu* rules, but, as we have seen above in the *bhikkhunī pāṭidesaniyā* rule on food, the replacement has also entailed the characteristic of discrimination. Conduct identified as a minor offence (*dukkhaṭṭa*) for monks, and thus not in the *bhikkhu pāṭimokkha* list of rules, is rated as a more serious infringement for nuns, and so is classified within the *bhikkhunī pāṭimokkha* rules. This partially accounts for the higher number in the Pali *vinaya* of *pāṭimokkha* rules for nuns, namely 311 rather than 227.

It is possible that some of these differences reflect the historical stratification of the *vinaya*. We have shown that some of the *vinayas* appear to contain later additions which incorporate an increasing accommodation of brahminical high-caste and food purity rules. Similarly, it may be that the *bhikkhunī pāṭimokkha* remained more open to changes such that changing expectations in relation to food could be included in its rules, whereas the same or similar rules for monks could only be added as *dukkhaṭṭa* offences, beyond the *pāṭimokkha* list. However, the unshared three rules on food seem to have a specific purpose, influenced by the social beliefs of the day, namely beliefs in women's impurity and heightened sexuality and as the natural cooks in the

community. Thus some of the rules, particularly in their foundation stories, hint at views not explicit in the rules themselves, views that also informed the discriminatory value of rules curbing sexual and sensual conduct. While the food rules and their stories also touch on or hint at the association between women and sexuality – the possible aphrodisiac effect of garlic, the beautifying effect of ghee – they may also be there to prevent nuns from continuing to act as cooks to the community. Some of the frame stories have nuns cooking for festivals and special occasions, and the rules may have been intended to curb such economic activity. As we saw in chapters 1 and 2, Buddhist cosmology associated food effort, including storing, preparation and cooking, with the deterioration of society and the development of lust. Therefore, Buddhism's renouncers had to avoid both storage and preparation, as reflected in many rules. The traditional place of women as cooks in their families may have meant that extra rules were considered necessary to ensure that they too understood that food preparation was taboo for Buddhist renouncers.

Chapter Five

Prohibited Foods

This chapter examines prohibited foodstuffs in the Theravāda *vinaya*. In Chapter 3, I examined the Theravāda *pāṭimokkha* rules in relation to eating for monks, and their parallels in other *vinayas*, and noted that these rules were not about prohibiting specific foods or food types. Rather, those rules mainly focus on how monks should obtain food in a manner that ensures their safety, allow them to avoid the main social activities and attendant dangers of lay life, avoid burdening lay donors and ensure that their behaviour does not go against lay expectations of how renouncers should behave. The training rules, contained within the *pāṭimokkha* but also incumbent upon novices, cover how to eat with decorum once the food has been obtained.

While the prohibition of alcohol is included in the *pāṭimokkha* rules for monks, no other food items are prohibited there *per se*, although it is forbidden to seek out luxury food items unless one is ill. However, we saw that for nuns some specific food prohibitions were included as additional *pāṭimokkha* rules. We suggested that the primary reason for the additional rules there was to prevent nuns from transferring the traditional women's role of cooking into their lives as renouncers. As we saw in Chapter 1, food preparation was specifically associated with cosmological, social and physical decline and to be avoided by Buddhist renouncers. This was in contrast to the aspirations of other, non-Buddhist renouncers and ascetics to avoid food in its entirety, to live on specific food stuffs, or to avoid particularly foods that involved harm (Chapter 4).

When examining possible reasons for the prohibition of garlic and raw grains for nuns, we considered the background religious context, in particular the possibility

that these prohibitions arose from the view that roots and raw grains might be seen as containing life, and therefore, as sentient beings. The religious tradition that best exemplifies such views is Jainism where we do see detailed prohibition of both vegetable and animal foods in accordance with its classification of the world into sentient beings of differing numbers of senses. We rejected this as the primary reason, following Schmithausen, since Buddhist cosmology was different from that of the Jains. Buddhism did not include plants among its categorization of sentient beings. Animals, however, are included under its categorization of sentient beings and we might, then, expect vegetarianism to have been an issue for early Buddhism and it was and continued to be for Jainism. It was certainly an issue early Buddhist monasticism had to address, but it was an option that – as we shall see – early Buddhism rejected, in contrast to some later forms of Buddhism in East Asia. This chapter will examine this approach to meat in early Buddhism.

When examining the *bhikkhunī pāṭimokkha* prohibitions on garlic and its relatives and raw grain in Chapter 4, we noted that these foods were also mostly prohibited for monks, but not within the *pāṭimokkha* rules. Rather, they were considered lesser offences, falling within the category of minor wrongdoings, *dukkāṭa*. So far we have mainly examined the *Suttavibhaṅga*, which provides the *pāṭimokkha* rules with foundation stories, for our understanding of food regulations for monks and nuns. If we turn to the *Mahāvagga*, the second major division of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, we find many more rules, mainly categorised as various types of minor wrongdoing, *dukkāṭa*. Among these, the 6th chapter, the *Bhesajjakkhandha* or the ‘medicine chapter’, includes prohibitions on certain types of food, including certain meats. This chapter will also examine these rules. It seems that we can classify the food types in the *Bhesajjakkhandha* into three: 1) completely prohibited, 2) conditionally allowed, and 3) completely allowed. Meat is dealt with in the first two categories.

Animal products are included in lists of important foodstuffs such as the nine sumptuous foodstuffs in the Pali *vinaya*, which are mentioned in relation to various prohibitions or restrictions. Thus in the nine sumptuous foodstuffs we find 1) milk and milk products, and 2) meat and fish. Dairy products are prohibited only because they are considered as luxury foodstuffs. This is quite different in Chinese Buddhism, as we shall see. Historically Indian and Chinese Buddhism have had completely different points of view concerning milk and milk products, which may reflect the differing attitude and treatment of cows in the two regions. We shall explore these differences later in this chapter. While meat is likewise restricted in that it is also categorised as a luxury food item, certain meats are in fact prohibited and meat eating under certain conditions is prohibited also. We shall investigate this in relation to two governing principles: the ten prohibited meats and the Three Kinds of Pure Meat.

To sum up, then, this chapter focuses on the inclusion of meat in the diet of early Buddhist renouncers and how this was justified, as well as the exclusion of certain meats from their diet and the possible reasons for this. It also looks at milk and milk products in order to see the attitude towards this in contrast to that in East Asian Buddhism. This chapter also investigates a number of issues relating to doctrine, meditation and craving that are related to meat-eating in Mahāyāna *sūtra*. These issues are considered here because they are important in the development of a vegetarian diet for Buddhist monastics, in a tradition maintained to varying degrees in East Asia today.

5-1. The range of foodstuffs in the medicine chapter (the *Bhesajjakkhandha*)

In terms of the level of the punishment of the violation, the rules in the medicine chapter (*Bhesajjakkhandha*) of the *Mahāvagga* could theoretically be considered as

identifying light infringements or recommendations for how to behave appropriately with little significance, rather than as serious infringements of the monastic code. However, the *Bhesajjakhandha* has considerable significance for monastic life in practice since the foodstuffs mentioned in it are used every day.

The Theravāda *vinaya* classifies food into four kinds:

- A. soft food (*bhojana*)
- B. hard food (*khādaniya*)
- C. Fluid food (*sāyaniya*)
- D. drink, i.e. liquid for drinking (*pāna*)⁶⁴¹

‘Soft food’ refers to staple food commonly eaten daily. The Theravāda *vinaya* classifies soft food into five kinds:

- A: rice (*odana*)
- B: gruel (*kummāsa*)
- C: flour (*sattu*)
- D: fish (*maccha*)
- E: meat (*maṃsa*)⁶⁴²

Raw grains (*āmakadhañña*) which are foodstuffs for *odana* are grouped into seven:

- A: fine variety of rice (*sāli*)
- B: common variety of rice (*vīhi*)
- C: barley (*yava*)
- D: wheat (*godhūma*)
- E: millet (*kaṇṇu*)
- F: bean (*varaka*)
- G: rye (*kudrūsaka*)⁶⁴³

It seems that these grains were used for daily food in those times. Indian historian, Prakash citing the *Jātaka* and other Buddhist texts explains that the “*Śāli* rice with its three famous varieties, *Raktaśāli*, *Kalamaśāli* and *Mahaśāli* was the favourite food of the

⁶⁴¹ Vin. III. p. 72.

⁶⁴² Vin. IV. p. 83.

⁶⁴³ Vin. IV. p. 264.

rich. The *Kalamaśāli* was cultivated in Magadha and is recommended as the best food in the *Upāsaka daśāṅga*.⁶⁴⁴ Prakash also mentions:

Barley and wheat were also used but they were not so popular. Barley continued to be parched and ground into meal. Cakes of wheat are frequently mentioned. Some other inferior cereals such as *Kodrava* (*Kodo* millet), *Śyāmāka* (*sawa* millet), *Cīnaka* (*bean*) and *Priyaṅgu* (*Italian millet*) were used by poor people and ascetics.⁶⁴⁵

Thus the categorisation in the Theravāda *vinaya* is confirmed by the *Jātaka*, the *Nikāyas* and the *Vinaya*.⁶⁴⁶

The Theravāda *vinaya* defines ‘hard food’ in contrast to soft food as follows:

Hard food is the rest except for the five soft foods, drink consumed after midday, medicine which can be stored for seven days and medicine which can be stored during life.⁶⁴⁷

There is another definition of hard food as follows:

Hard food is the rest except for five kinds of soft food and water for brushing one’s teeth.⁶⁴⁸

According to the two definitions above, hard food means food except for the five kinds of soft food, liquid based foodstuffs and medicine which cannot be used for food: the medicine stored for seven days is enumerated as ghee, butter, oil, honey and molasses. These are liquid based items, except for molasses. The medicine stored during life is considered as that which includes vegetables, herbs, salt and so on which cannot be used as staple foodstuffs. Even though the *vinaya* text does not mention the names of hard food, vegetables, fruits, nuts and so on belong to the hard food.

The Theravāda *vinaya* mentions eight kinds of drinks as follows:

Mango drink (*ambapāna*), plum drink (*jambupāna*), coconut drink (*cocapāna*), banana drink (*mocapāna*), honey drink (*madhupāna*), grape drink (*muddikapāna*), lotus root drink (*sālukapāna*) and *phārusaka* flower drink (*phārusakapāna*).⁶⁴⁹

⁶⁴⁴ Prakash 1961: 58-59.

⁶⁴⁵ *Ibid*: 60.

⁶⁴⁶ *Ibid*.

⁶⁴⁷ Vin. IV. p. 83. Author’s translation. This and subsequent translations are the author's own unless stated otherwise.

⁶⁴⁸ *Ibid*. p. 92.

Besides these drinks, the Buddha permits fruit drink (*phalarasa*) but does not permit the following: grain drink, drink made of leaves (*pattarasa*) except for vegetables, petal drink (*puppharasa*) except for liquorice petal, and sugarcane drink (*ucchurasa*).

5-2. Attitude to milk and milk products

Dairy products have been important and highly regarded foodstuffs in India since ancient times. These foodstuffs have functioned as one of the major foodstuffs but in spite of that Theravāda *vinaya* prohibits their use except for when monks are ill. This section explores Buddhist attitudes to dairy products within their cultural contexts.

5-2-1. Attitude to milk and milk products before Buddhism

From the early stage of Indian history, milk and milk products have played an essential role in diet and religion, as attested in brahminical literature over the centuries. The oldest extant Indian text, the *Ṛg-veda*, thought to date back to around 1500 BCE frequently mentions milk (*payas*).⁶⁵⁰ It describes milk as the ‘water of heaven.’⁶⁵¹ In the *Atharva Veda*, the *payas*, denotes ‘sap’ or ‘fluid’ in plants which provide with life and vigor.⁶⁵²

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, regarded as the earliest of the *brāhmaṇa* texts, states that milk is used for cooking with grain (*kṣīraudana*).⁶⁵³ Milk mixed with *soma* is also

⁶⁴⁹ Vin. I. p. 246.

⁶⁵⁰ ṚV. 1. 164. 28; 2.14.10; 4.3.9; 5.85.2; 10.30.13. etc.

⁶⁵¹ ṚV. 1. 64.5; 166.3; 3.33.1.4; 4.57.8. etc.

⁶⁵² AV. 3.5.1; 10.1.12; 13.1.9.

⁶⁵³ ŚB. 2.5.3.4; 11.5.7.5.

used for sacrifice.⁶⁵⁴ The Vedic texts mention that butter (*ghṛta*) is used for sacrifices. In the sacrifice, the butter was thrown into fire and Agni is described as ‘butter-faced (*ghṛta-pratīka*),’⁶⁵⁵ ‘propitiated with butter (*ghṛta-prasatta*),’⁶⁵⁶ and ‘fond of butter (*ghṛta-pri*).’ It is said in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* that melted butter (*ājya*) is suitable for gods; half-melted butter (*āyuta*) for the deceased fathers, butter (*ghṛta*) for men and fresh butter (*navanīta*) for anointing an embryo.⁶⁵⁷

One of the earliest sources of Hindu law, the *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*, makes it clear that milk products are valued over other food sources as offerings for ancestors and Brahmins. It states that ancestors are satisfied with cow milk and milk pudding for twelve years: sesame, bean, rice, barley and water for a month; fish, the meats of antelope, *Ruru* antelope, rabbit, tortoise, boar and sheep for several years.⁶⁵⁸ It also states that milk and curd are considered as suitable items to offer to brāhmins along with firewood, water, fodder, roots, fruits, honey, a promise of safety, beds donated without asking, seats, shelters, carriages, roasted grain, *saphari* fish, millet, and garlands.⁶⁵⁹

Hindus have used ‘the five products of the cow (*pañchagavya*: milk, curd, ghee, urine and dung)’ for the purpose of ritual purification as well as utilitarian use from ancient times to this day. The anthropogeographer, Frederick J. Simoons, says that the purificatory use of the five products of the cow has started from the rise of the concept of the sacred cow⁶⁶⁰ and that “the subsequent development of the sacred cow concept seems to have enhanced the position of cow’s milk and products in

⁶⁵⁴ Simoons 1974: 29.

⁶⁵⁵ RV.1.143.7; 3.1.18; 5.11.1; 10.21.7. etc.

⁶⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 5.15.1.

⁶⁵⁷ AB. 1.3.

⁶⁵⁸ GDh. 15. 15.

⁶⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 17. 3.

⁶⁶⁰ Simoons 1974: 21.

ceremony”.⁶⁶¹ Simoons points out that the *Dharma Sūtra*, composed between the 6th and the 2nd centuries B.C.E.,⁶⁶² explicitly mention the purificatory role of milk and milk products⁶⁶³ and that “this was roughly contemporaneous both with the rise of Buddhism, starting late in the 6th century C.E., and with the development of the sacred cow concept”.⁶⁶⁴ He writes that, according to the *Dharma Sūtra*, the sacredness of the cow is indicated as follows:

- A. it was meritorious for a man to drink a gruel made of barley that had passed through a cow (SBE 14/1882, p. 299).
- B. land was purified if cows walked on it (SBE 14/ 1882, pp. 24, 188).
- C. cowpens were sacred places (SBE 2/1896, p. 276; 14/1882, pp. 117, 249, 311); and in the cowpen, milk was viewed as fit to drink even if it came from someone whose food should not be eaten (SBE 14/1882, p. 171).
- D. cow dung was used in removing defilement (SBE 14/1882, p. 169).
- E. a man could be cleansed by touching cow dung (SBE 14/1882, p. 174).
- F. it was also smeared on the earth to purify it of defilement (SBE 14/1882, pp. 24, 64, 172, 188), and to cleanse places intended for ceremonial use (SBE 14/1882, pp. 262, 307).
- G. metal objects were cleansed by scrubbing them with cow dung (SBE 14/1882, pp. 168, 190) or immersing them completely in cow urine for seven days and nights (SBE 14/1882, p. 190).
- H. Cow's milk and milk products also served purificatory roles. And, for the first time, the five products were used together in purifying men internally (SBE 14/1882, pp. 131, 183, 324-328) and were even designated "panchagavya" (SBE 14/1882, pp. 131, 325).⁶⁶⁵

Simoons remarks, further, that “by the time of the *Dharma śāstra*, the earliest of which the *Manu Smṛti* was likely written in its final form in the 2nd and 3rd century C.E.”⁶⁶⁶

⁶⁶¹ Simoons 1974: 23.

⁶⁶² Basham 1954: 112.

⁶⁶³ See Introduction concerning the date of the establishment of the *Dharma Sūtras* by Patrick Olivelle and P. V. Kane.

⁶⁶⁴ Brown 1957: 35, cited Simoons 1974: 29.

⁶⁶⁵ Simoons 1974: 29. The translation is Simoons’.

⁶⁶⁶ Basham 1954: 112, cited Simoons 1974: 29.

there was a situation even more similar to that of modern Hinduism.”⁶⁶⁷ He further mentions that “during the Gupta Period (c. C.E. 300-550), when the doctrine of the sanctity of the cow was first stated strongly,”⁶⁶⁸ “hardly a single religious ceremony was performed without cow's milk or its products.”⁶⁶⁹

Taken as a whole, then, Indian classical texts consider milk and milk products as essential items for the dietary and religious purposes.

5-2-2. Attitude to milk and milk products in Theravāda Buddhism

5-2-2-1. Attitude to milk and milk products in Buddhist cosmology

In Chapters 1 and 2 we discussed the *Aggañña Sutta*, *Dīgha Nikāya* 27, which contains an account of the origin and the evolution of the universe as a result of eating. The importance of milk products in ancient India, and its association with purity, seems to be reflected in this text, which describes the first foods in terms of milk products and honey:

Then (on one such occasion) an earth-essence spread out on the waters. It appeared in the same way as (does) the spreading out (of skin) on top of boiled milk-rice as it cools down. It had colour, smell and taste; its colour was like sweet ghee or cream, its taste like fine clear honey.⁶⁷⁰

The text mentions the three essential components of food, namely colour, smell and taste, in Theravāda Buddhism⁶⁷¹ and in doing so compares the early food in relation to three foodstuffs, ghee or butter and honey, which are traditionally considered as

⁶⁶⁷ *Ibid.* cited Simoons 1974: 29.

⁶⁶⁸ Brown 1957: 39. cited Simoons 1974: 29.

⁶⁶⁹ Maity 1957: 93; p. 23.

⁶⁷⁰ Collins 1993: 341-342.

⁶⁷¹ T. XXIX. p. 55a. The reason why we use Chinese sources is that the Theravāda texts, even the *Visuddhimagga*, do not mention these essential ingredients.

sumptuous foodstuffs as we will see later. In this classification of the essential factors of food, ghee and butter are mentioned as having an excellent colour.

Another cosmological text, the *Cakkavattisīhanāda Sutta*, the *Dīgha Nikāya* 26, remarks that when humans are corrupted morally and their lifespan becomes ten years, sumptuous foodstuffs such as ghee, butter, sesame oil, treacle and salt disappear and coarse grain such as *kudrūsa* would be staple food. Here, ghee and butter are connected to a morally wholesome human period and are considered as palatable foodstuffs; on the other hand, *kudrūsa* grain, to morally a morally unwholesome era, and regarded as insipid food (see chapter 1).⁶⁷²

5-2-2-2. Attitude to milk and milk products in the Theravāda vinaya

Milk and milk products are frequently mentioned in the Theravāda *vinaya*, and regulations governing them are found in the *Bhesajjakkhanda*. This chapter identifies five foodstuffs, which include two dairy products, as Five Medicines. The five are ghee, butter, oil, honey and molasses.⁶⁷³ Identifying them as medicine, and not just food, means that when monks are ill, they could use the five foodstuffs as medicine even after midday, i.e. after the time by which they should have finished eating for the day in accordance with the *vikālabhojana* precept (See chapter 3).⁶⁷⁴ The background story to this regulation mentions that these ‘Five Medicines’ are used to provide nutrients to the monks who have become emaciated or lost their appetite.⁶⁷⁵

As well as being included among the Five Medicines, ghee and butter are among four dairy products included in the list of nine ‘sumptuous foodstuffs’ in the 39th *pācittiya*, namely, milk (*khīra*), curd (*dadhi*), ghee (*sappi*), butter (*navanīta*), oil

⁶⁷² DN. III. p. 71.

⁶⁷³ Vin. I. p. 199.

⁶⁷⁴ *Ibid.* p. 200.

⁶⁷⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 199-200.

(*tela*), honey (*madhu*), molasses (*phāṇita*), fish (*maccha*), and meat (*maṃsa*).⁶⁷⁶ Even though the number and specifics of the items included in the lists of sumptuous foodstuffs in each Buddhist school is different, all the major Buddhist *vinaya* mention dairy products. The *vinaya* all list these foods in order to restrict them, including by prohibiting monks from demanding them. This is because the dishes made from those foodstuffs are too luxurious and palatable for monks to consume them.

On the other hand, because of their nutritional density, these foods are also useful in providing concentrated nutrition to monks who are ill, so some of them are allowed within the Five Medicines, which can be consumed after noon, and they can be sought out for someone who is ill, in contrast to *pācittiya* 39.

5-2-3. Attitude to dairy products in the Mahāyāna Sūtras

The Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* strongly asserts that we should not consume any kind of meat. The attitude to meat-eating in this text is completely different from that of the texts before Mahāyāna. Given that dairy products also come from animals, what, then, is the attitude to milk and milk products? The *bodhisattva* Kāśyapa in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* asks this question of the Buddha, who has preached that to eat meat is to destroy the seed of compassion:

If the Tathāgata established the rule that we should not consume meat, is it also not acceptable that we use the five sumptuous dairy foodstuffs, milk, curd, butter, cheese and ghee?

O good man, you should not take this attitude, which is like that of the followers of Jainism.⁶⁷⁷

The Buddha's rejection of the suggestion that dairy products should be prohibited is further confirmed in another part of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, where the Buddha enumerates a list of excellent foodstuffs which include dairy products: milk, curd,

⁶⁷⁶ Vin. IV. p. 88. I have put the items, milk and curd in front to emphasize related items.

⁶⁷⁷ T. XII. p. 386a; T. XII. p. 626a; T. vol. LII. p. 301a-b; X. XXXVI. p. 400b.

butter, sugarcane, rice, molasses, all kinds of grains, black molasses and oil.⁶⁷⁸ Even though the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* strictly prohibits meat-eating it does extend this prohibition to dairy products. The use of dairy in it is identical to that of the texts that predate Mahāyāna.

In another text, the *Aṅgulimālīya Sūtra*, which also prohibits meat-eating, a youth, who has received the prediction of becoming an ideal universal ruler from the Buddha Kāśyapa, asks his mother to give him various excellent foodstuffs such as milk, curd, fish, meat, sesame and beans to obtain physical vigor.⁶⁷⁹ In this text as well, milk and milk products are treated as nutritious, not problematic, food items.

These two Mahāyāna texts, which are classified as the texts which reflect the change of the viewpoint towards meat in Mahāyāna,⁶⁸⁰ continue to show that milk and milk products are considered as excellent, sumptuous and acceptable food items in Indian Mahāyāna texts.

5-2-3-1. The *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* (楞嚴經) and the change of attitude to dairy products in Chinese Buddhism

The *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* have all been significant for Buddhist monastic cuisine in East Asia. These texts contain strict prohibitions against eating meat and the five pungent vegetables (see chapter 4).⁶⁸¹ However, there is conspicuous difference between the the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* and the other two, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* in relation to dairy.

⁶⁷⁸ T. XII. p. 386a. I have put milk and milk products foremost for comparability.

⁶⁷⁹ T. II. p. 539a. I have changed the order of foodstuffs for comparability.

⁶⁸⁰ Suzuki 2003: 1-5.

⁶⁸¹ T. XXIV. p. 1005b. The Mahāyāna *Brahmajāla Sūtra* mentions the five pungent vegetables, garlic, scallions, spring onions, chive and *hiṅgu*, but there are varieties of the names of the five pungent vegetables in Buddhist texts.

Before going further, we shall touch on the establishment of the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* regarding two aspects.

Firstly, many scholars assert that the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* was composed or compiled in China,⁶⁸² unlike the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. If this is correct, we might see the difference in attitudes between the texts in terms of geographic boundaries between cultures. The geographer, Frederick J. Simoons, whose work in relation to milk and milk products we drew on earlier, says that the world can be divided into two broad categories relevant to this, namely areas where people milk animals and use milk and milk products, and areas where people do not. In this classification, East Asian countries such as China, Japan and Korea are mentioned as the largest non-milking areas.⁶⁸³ According to him, the non-milking people of Eastern Asia and tropical Africa have specific beliefs and attitudes to milking and the use of milk and milk products. For example, the practice of milking is equated with “stealing essential food from the young nursing animal” and is considered as immoral behaviour. Furthermore, people believe that milking animals could incite “divine retribution.”⁶⁸⁴

Now, let’s examine the viewpoint of the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* to see if it confirms this view. In this paragraph, the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* explicitly opposes the use of dairy.

If monks do not wear clothes which are made with the thread, cotton and silk from an eastern country, do not put on leather shoes from this country, do not wear the clothes which are made with the leather and fur of animals and do not consume milk, curd and ghee, monks like this should truly transcend this world and be liberated from the cycle of rebirth.⁶⁸⁵

The *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* was a popular text in East Asia, playing a significant role in the spread of Chan Buddhism in East Asian countries. The text has numerous

⁶⁸² Iwaki 2004: 638-642.

⁶⁸³ Simoons 1980: 83.

⁶⁸⁴ *Ibid.* p. 84.

⁶⁸⁵ T. XIX, p. 132a

commentaries and Ronald Epstein claims that the number of the commentaries amounts to 127.⁶⁸⁶

A number of the commentaries on the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, which were composed in East Asia regardless of whether or not the *sūtra* itself was, comment in detail on this point.

The *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* states that in order to enter meditation, we should eradicate lust, killing and stealing in our behaviour. The prohibition of dairy is mentioned under the item of killing. Abandoning the use of milk products is considered a precondition to entering *samādhi*.⁶⁸⁷ All of the commentaries take up the issue of dairy products as an aspect of 'killing' in their account of lust, killing and stealing. These commentaries clearly express the view of milk and milk products distinctive to Chinese Buddhism. The *Lengyanjing zhizhangshu* (楞嚴經指掌疏) criticises the use of milk and milk products as follows:

Milk signifies cow-milk. Curd is made by processing the milk and butter is produced from the curd. The most purified product is called ghee. Even though not killing, excessive milking could cause cows to be physically damaged. Is it right behaviour of people who have compassion that you take the food for calves and feed yourselves? Therefore, monks should also not wear clothes woven from silk thread and fabric, and should not consume milk, curd and so on.⁶⁸⁸

This commentary points out that the use of milk and milk products could cause harm to animals even though killing is not actually involved, and that there could be various moral problems caused by the use of milk and milk products.

Another commentary for the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, the *Lengyanjing guanshe* (楞嚴經貫攝) contrasts the morality of religious practice with the immorality of the use of milk and milk products as follows:

⁶⁸⁶ Accessed from <http://online.sfsu.edu/rone/Buddhism/authenticity.htm> on 15/5/2013.

⁶⁸⁷ X. XI. p. 839c.

⁶⁸⁸ X. XVI. p. 210b. Author's translation.

Pure *bhikṣu* and *bodhisattva* do not dig and pluck even grasses by the roads as their utmost compassion reaches to trees and grasses. How then could they who have great compassion take food as the blood and flesh of sentient beings? You should not consume blood and flesh, and as silk thread, fabric and silk clothes are made from silk worms, and leather shoes, clothes of leather, and clothes of fur, and milk, curd and ghee are produced by the physical parts of animals, these are parts of the bodies of animals.⁶⁸⁹

This commentary emphasizes that milk and milk products are part of an animal's body, and states that taking dairy products is closely related to killing or harming animals. This particular commentary does not assume that taking dairy involves actual killing.

However in modern dairy production, e.g. in the U.K., cows are mated and calves are born only for the sake of making the cow lactate for human consumption: the calves themselves are killed at birth.⁶⁹⁰ This is not what is envisaged here in this passage, but rather just a taking of part of the milk intended for the calf, as in Indian dairy farming. However, the next commentary I shall cite presupposes dairy farming in which the calves are killed.⁶⁹¹ The Chinese attitudes expressed here also do not seem to take into account the sanctity of the cow in India, where male cattle are used for ploughing, for example, rather than meat.

This same understanding is expressed in the commentary, the *Murenshenggao* (木人剩稿):

⁶⁸⁹ X. XV. p. 474b. Author's translation.

⁶⁹⁰ Almost all dairy products depend on killing and harm to cattle to produce them. For an exception see the following site, accessed from <http://www.ahimsamilk.org/> on 16/6/2013. This organization produces and sells milk and milk products which are slaughter-free. It says that no cows or bulls are killed or exploited to produce it.

⁶⁹¹ The case of killing calves in dairy industry in the UK. Accessed from <http://www.animalaid.org.uk/h/n/CAMPAIGNS/vegetarianism/ALL/477/>, on 15/9/2015. The case of Australia can be accessed from <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/killing-of-young-calves-is-dairy-industrys-dark-secret/story-e6frg6nf-1226204115002>, on 15/9/2015. I presume that the calves killed are consumed as meat, rather than discarded as is the case in the modern wasteful dairy practice found in the U.K. This stems in part from the British public distaste for veal, which is seen as cruel, without the public realising that their desire to avoid cruelty in fact leads to what might be considered even worse practices.

Seeking a profit, they do not leave any milk for the calves to drink. This harms lives (of the calves), and therefore, we should not drink. To increase the quantity of milk, they kill the calves. Through this, we can realize that milk is produced through killing lives. Therefore, milk is not suitable for consumption.⁶⁹²

In these commentaries for the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*, milk is considered as the food item which is not suitable for ingesting due to the immorality which causes not only indirect killing and harming but also direct killing and harming. This concurs with one of two contemporary issues concerning the use of dairy, the issue of morality in relation to cruelty to cows and calves, and the issue of whether dairy products are detrimental to our health.

Milk has been thought to lead to digestive problems which are related to allergies, including asthma. John McDougall, a writer on health issues, gives a distinctive analysis of the reason for dairy being seriously harmful to our health, stating that milk and pus derive from the same bodily fluid.⁶⁹³

In order to look at the stark contrast between Chinese and Indian attitudes to dairy in Buddhist texts, we shall compare the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* which is said to have been translated into Chinese in the early 8th century BCE,⁶⁹⁴ with the travelogues written by early Chinese pilgrims.

Chinese pilgrim, I-Ching, who studied and travelled in India in the late 7th century CE (675-685 CE), describes consuming meals at Bantanna monastery (般彈那寺) as follows:

Next, they offered dry rice and bean dishes, stirred in cheese in broth and put in various seasonings. When eating food, they used the right hand. When the stomach was half full, they offered cake and fruits, and lastly offered milk, curd and sugar. When feeling thirsty, they drank

⁶⁹² Ji. XXXV. p. 485b. Author's translation.

⁶⁹³ Accessed from <http://www.rense.com/general38/pus.htm>, on 7/7/2013.

⁶⁹⁴ The *Catalogue of Buddhist texts of Kaiyuan Era* (開元釋教錄) says that the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* was translated in about 713 AD, but *A Sequel to Illustrational Records of Translation of Buddhist Scriptures* (續古今譯經圖記) mentions that the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* is rendered into Chinese in 705 CE.

cool water in summer and winter likewise. These are what monks consumed, and in rituals, they ate alike. When performing rituals, they thought that rituals should be prepared generously. Therefore, cake and rice were abundant on the trays and bowls, butter and curd were provided at many places within the premises, and therefore, every lay-follower could receive meals. This is none other than what the *vinaya* mentions: when the King, *Rishenguang* (日勝光) in person treated the Buddha and monks, food, butter and curd were left over and the ground overflowed with them.⁶⁹⁵

The *Datang xiyuji* (大唐西域記) written by Xuanzang, who studied and travelled in India earlier in the 7th century CE, mentions that monks who followed Devadatta did not consume milk and curd.⁶⁹⁶

5-3. Attitudes to meat

Meat is frequently mentioned as a major issue in religious food prohibition. In Pali Buddhism as well, meat is the issue which is most closely related to food prohibition.

Meat prohibition in Pali Buddhism has two forms: 1) complete prohibition (i.e. the ten prohibited meats); and 2) conditional permission (i.e. the three kinds of pure meat). This section explores these in the context of the historical development of attitudes to meat in ancient India. I shall look in general at why these prohibitions and limitations are imposed regarding meat. In particular, I examine whether or not the issue of craving for food influenced these rules about meat eating.

5-3-1. Attitudes to meat before the Theravāda Buddhism

⁶⁹⁵ T. LIV, p. 209c. Author's translation.

⁶⁹⁶ T. LI, p. 928a.

The *Ṛgveda* frequently mentions meat-eating and the slaughter of animals for sacrifices, rituals and guests. Vedic texts frequently state that major gods enjoyed consuming meat. The *Ṛgveda* refers to a great flesh-offering to Indra in which he consumed the flesh of one hundred buffaloes.⁶⁹⁷ The god Āgni ate ox and barren cows and Soma as a god is also related to killing animals.⁶⁹⁸ In that the flesh of animals was both used in Vedic sacrifices and eaten by people after the sacrifices,⁶⁹⁹ it is clear that Vedic religion affirmed the killing of animals and eating of meat..

Om Prakash mentions that a tendency against meat-eating and slaughter emerged in the later Vedic period:

In the later Vedic period a feeling of revulsion against meat eating, especially beef is found in almost all our works. The *Atharvaveda* regards beef eating as an offence against forefathers (*Pitṛs*). Br̥haspati, it is said, takes away the progeny of those who consume a cow. There was also an injunction against the slaughter of horses in a sacrifice. People who observed a vow, generally, abstained from meat diet and Brahmanas took only sanctified meat and that too of pure animals.⁷⁰⁰

The Indian historian, D N. Jha, also says that antipathy to beef eating gains ground at the time of Yājñavalkya.⁷⁰¹

Prakash mentions meat-eating in the times of the *Kalpa Sūtra* such as the *Śrautasūtra*, the *Gṛhya Sūtra* and the *Dharma Sūtra* that “The notion of clean and unclean meat was well developed in the *sūtras*...Eating flesh of a dog, a man, a village cock, a boar and a carnivorous animal is considered a sin.”⁷⁰² Given this notion that there were clean meats and unclean meats and that only the clean meats were to be eaten, it seems possible that the notion of prohibited meats in early Buddhism could

⁶⁹⁷ RV. VIII. 12.8ab cited Jha 2002: 29.

⁶⁹⁸ Jha 2002: 36.

⁶⁹⁹ *Ibid*: 29.

⁷⁰⁰ Prakash 1961: 17-18.

⁷⁰¹ Jha 2002: 36.

⁷⁰² Prakash 1961: 39-40.

have derived not from specifically Buddhist ideas about food, but from notions of impurity or taboo within ancient Indian culture more broadly.

5-3-2. Attitude to meat in the Theravāda *vinaya*

Generally speaking, Pali Buddhism has a comparatively flexible attitude to almost all kinds of food compared to other Indian religions, in particular Jainism. Nonetheless the Theravāda *vinaya* lists ten meats that are completely prohibited and also regulates the consumption of meat that is pure in three ways. Here we shall examine these two rules.

5-3-2-1. Complete prohibition of the ten kinds of meat

The Medicine Chapter (the *Bhesajjakkhandha*) in the Pali *vinaya* prohibits consuming the ten prohibited meats. The ten prohibited meats are as follows:

- A. human being
- B. elephant
- C. horse
- D. dog
- E. snake
- F. lion
- G. tiger
- H. panther
- I. bear
- J. hyena⁷⁰³

⁷⁰³ Vin. IV. pp. 216-220.

The other *vinaya* also contain a list of up to ten prohibited meats. The meats listed by the major Buddhist *vinaya* overlap considerably but contain a few differences, as follows:

	Theravāda ⁷⁰⁴	Dharmaguptaka ⁷⁰⁵	Mahīśāsaka ⁷⁰⁶
1	Human being	Human being	Human being
2	Elephant	Elephant	Elephant
3	Horse	Horse	Horse
4	Dog	Dog	Dog
5	Snake	Dragon (Snake) ⁷⁰⁷	Snake
6	Lion		Lion
7	Tiger		Tiger
8	Panther		Leopard
9	Bear		Bear ⁷⁰⁸
10	Hyena		

Mahāsāṃghika ⁷⁰⁹	Sarvāstivāda ⁷¹⁰	Mūlasarvāstivāda ⁷¹¹
Human being	Human being	Human being
Elephant	Elephant	Elephant
Horse	Horse	Horse
Dog	Dog	Dragon (Snake)
Dragon (Snake)	Snake	
Lion		
Swine		
Monkey		
Eagle		
Bird ⁷¹²		

⁷⁰⁴ Vin. IV. pp. 216-220

⁷⁰⁵ T. XXII. pp. 868b-869a.

⁷⁰⁶ T. XXII. pp. 148b-149a.

⁷⁰⁷ The original order of the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* to meats prohibited is as follows:

1. Elephant 2. Horses 3. Dragon (Snake). 4. Dog 5. Human being.

⁷⁰⁸ The original order of the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* is as follows:

1. Human being 2. Elephant 3. Horse 4. Lion 5. Tiger 6. Leopard 7. Bear 8. Dog 9. Snake.

⁷⁰⁹ T. XXII. pp. 486a-487a.

⁷¹⁰ T. XXIII. pp. 185c-187a.

⁷¹¹ T. XXIV. pp. 3c-5b.

Table 5.1. Meats prohibited by major Buddhist *vinayas*

The Theravāda *vinaya* contextualises the prohibition on human flesh with a story about a faithful laywoman who had promised to offer meat broth to a monk who was ill. On failing to obtain any meat, she cut the flesh of her thigh, prepared the broth from that and offered that broth to the monk. Having learned of this matter, the Buddha rebuked the monk who ate broth for not having asked what kind of meat it was made from.⁷¹³

Other *vinayas* have similar stories in which a laywoman offers flesh from her thigh.⁷¹⁴ With the exception of the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*, the others state that not asking what kind of meat being offered is an offence of wrongdoing (*dukkata*).⁷¹⁵ Among the ten meats, eating human flesh is considered as the gravest offence in almost all *vinaya*.⁷¹⁶ In most *vinaya* rules about eating human flesh the Buddha rebukes the monk for not asking what kind of flesh was being offered to him. The Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* states that people loathe eating human flesh.⁷¹⁷ The Mūlasarvāstivāda confirms this and relates it not to morality but to purity. There the Buddha says to monks as follows:

When eating human flesh, people loathe him. Among meats, human flesh is the most malodorous, the filthiest and the most disgusting. Therefore, monks should not eat it.⁷¹⁷

⁷¹² The original order of the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* is as follows:

1. Human being 2. Dragon (Snake) 3. Elephant 4. Horse 5. Dog 6. Bird 7. Eagle 8. Swine 9. Monkey 10. Lion.

⁷¹³ Vin. I. pp. 216-218.

⁷¹⁴ The Dharmaguptaka: T. XXII. pp. 868c-869a; the Mahīśāsaka: T. XXII. pp. 148b-148c; the Mahāsāṃghika: T. XXII. 486a-486c; the Sarvāstivāda: T. XXIII. pp 185c-186b; the Mūlasarvāstivāda: T. XXIV. pp. 3c-4b.

⁷¹⁵ Only the Mahāsāṃghika does not separately identify a punishment for eating human flesh.

⁷¹⁶ T. XXIII. p. 96a.

⁷¹⁷ T. XXIV. p. 4a.

Since this statement in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* does not mention morality but impurity, it is reminiscent of the *abhakṣya* regulations of Hindu *Dharma Sūtra* (see. Ch. 4).

The second story in the Theravāda *vinaya* is about the meat of elephants. One day, a king's elephant died. There was a shortage of food at that time, so people ate the meat of the elephant. They also gave it to monks on their alms-round. Then, people criticized the monks for eating the flesh of an elephant, a royal emblem, and feared that there would trouble when the king found out.⁷¹⁸ The Pali, the Dharmaguptaka, the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* state that the reason why eating elephant meat is prohibited is that elephants are associated with the king and used for military purposes.⁷¹⁹ Elephants were considered as essential parts of military equipment in war. The *Kāmandakiya Nītisāra*⁷²⁰ says that defeating the enemy and winning wars are dependant on the role of elephants, and that the royal army should have as many elephant as possible.⁷²¹ The great c.5th century Indian writer, Kālidāsa, wrote that it was not appropriate behaviour for a king to kill an elephant, even one which was harming people.⁷²² Besides their use for military purposes, elephants also had economic importance such as their use in heavy work like construction and load-bearing. Also ivory was, even in ancient India, a valuable commodity.⁷²³ Due to their military and economic significance, elephants were considered as valuable and high status animals. Similarly, horses formed a part of Indian military units too and were also considered as essential animals, unsuitable for

⁷¹⁸ Vin. I. p. 219.

⁷¹⁹ The Dharmaguptaka: T. XXII. p. 868b; the Sarvāstivāda: T. XXIII. p. 186b; the Mūlasarvāstivāda: T. XXIV. p. 4c.

⁷²⁰ Banarji 1971: 258. It is possible that the *Kāmandakiya Nītisāra* is based on the *Arthaśāstra* written by Kauṭilya.

⁷²¹ *Kāmandakiya Nītisāra*. XIX. p. 62 cited Dutt 1896: 128-129.

⁷²² Raghuvamśa, V. 50; IX. 74.

⁷²³ Maity 1957:129.

human consumption not only for monks but also laity. These two animals were regarded as important animals.⁷²⁴

In contrast to this interpretation of elephant meat being wrong to eat because of its royal associations, importance and high status, the background stories in some *vinaya* suggest that elephant meat was prohibited because of its impurity.⁷²⁵ The *Mahīśāsaka vinaya* speaks of the repulsiveness of elephant meat and that people consider the elephant meat as impure, smelly and filthy.⁷²⁶ In the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya*, the background story of the prohibition of the elephant meat is as follows:

When the elephant of the king, Bimbisara died, *caṇḍāla* ate elephant meat and monks also consumed the meat. At that time, Jīvaka approached the place of the Buddha...informed the Buddha (what he had seen)....He asked the Buddha to stop the monks from consuming the flesh of elephants because renouncers are the people who receive respect from lay people.⁷²⁷

The *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya* also mentions that eating elephant meat is related to disrespected behavior. These rules on elephant meat seem to be related to the idea of the impurity of elephant meat in society at the time.

The background story of regarding horse meat in the Theravāda *vinaya* is the same as the story of elephant. In this story, the reason why this regulation has been established is that horses are the emblem of a king and are related to military use by a king.⁷²⁸ It can be inferred that killing these two animals would be punished by royal authority as well.⁷²⁹ The *Mahīśāsaka* and the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya* again seem to have

⁷²⁴ *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra*. IV, 66.

⁷²⁵ The *Mahīśāsaka*: T. XXII. p. 148c; the *Mahāsāṃghika*: T. XXII. p. 487a.

⁷²⁶ T. XXII. p. 148c

⁷²⁷ T. XXII. pp. 486c-487a. Author's translation.

⁷²⁸ The *Dharmaguptaka*: T. XXII. p. 868b; the *Sarvāstivāda*: T. XXIII. p. 186b; the *Mūlasarvāstivāda*: T. XXIV. p. 5a.

⁷²⁹ Vin. I. p. 219.

a different perspective on why horse flesh should not be concerned, namely that it is impure and filthy and causes abhorrence and contempt towards those who eat it.⁷³⁰

Overall, the main reason for the prohibition on eating the flesh of elephants and horses appears to be their association with royalty and their significance for the military. Their loss could jeopardize the security of the kingdom. The attitude to elephants and horses in the ten prohibited meats seems to reflect the relationship between the Buddhist Sangha and royal authority, the king being identified in early texts as one of the most important lay supporters.

Dog meat is considered repulsive and disgusting in the Theravāda *vinaya*.⁷³¹ This reflects attitudes within the cultural context at the time. Hindu *Dharma Sūtra* regards dogs as extremely polluting. The *Manu Smṛti* says that food offered to brahmins after the *śrāddha* ritual should not be seen by a *caṇḍāla*, a pig, a cock, a dog and a menstruating woman.⁷³² The food touched by a dog, like the leftovers of a member of the *śūdra* class, is defined as food that one must avoid consuming.⁷³³ It seems that the image of dog in the Theravāda *vinaya* is similar to these brahminical views. In the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, the Buddha prohibits the consumption of dog meat on the following grounds:

If you approach noblemen or if noblemen come and see you, after you have eaten dog meat, or if they hear that Buddhist monks eat dog meat, then they would leave, deserting you due to the fact that you are the same as *caṇḍāla*.... Eating [dog meat] is an offence of wrongdoing (*dukkata*).⁷³⁴

Only the Theravāda and the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* provide sufficiently detailed background stories for us to understand the relationship between the prohibition on dog meat and ideas of impurity as a social custom at that time. It seems to show that

⁷³⁰ The Mahiśāsaka: T. XXII. p. 148c; the Mahāsāṃghika: T. XXII. p. 487a.

⁷³¹ Vin. I. p. 219.

⁷³² MS. 3. 240.

⁷³³ Olivelle 2002: 352.

⁷³⁴ T. XXIII. p. 186c.

the idea of impurity and contempt of dogs at that time was explicit and strong. For the Buddhist Sangha, it would be not easy to ignore customary ideas taking into account its relationship with lay society, even if it was minded to do so. We see no evidence of the latter – the evidence of the texts is that the Sangha accepted the dominant societal views on this subject.

The attitude towards snakes (*ahi*) in the Theravāda *vinaya* is twofold: they are considered on one hand fearsome and harmful, and on the other awe-inspiring and the possible source of benign help.⁷³⁵ In the Theravāda *vinaya*, the snake king Supassa says that snakes harm monks [by biting]⁷³⁶ and in the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, the snake king, Shan Xian (善現龍王) remarks that the snake has supernatural power and dignity and could burn an entire country.⁷³⁷ In the background story of the prohibition on snakemeat, unlike in the background stories relating to other animals, the *nāga* (either a snake king⁷³⁸ or a member of snake society⁷³⁹) has a conversation with the Buddha, a story that indicates religious beliefs about snakes that were current at the time. The Theravāda Buddhist and Hindu texts show us that *nāga* worship was popular among ordinary people since at least the later Vedic times. *Nāga* worship is in part based on the fear of *nāga*, the venom of which is lethal. The *Āśvalāyana Gr̥hya Sūtra* states that people offer food to snakes with the wish that snakes will not harm them.⁷⁴⁰ Buddhist texts reflect this ambivalent attitude of both fear and awe towards *nāga*, and the prohibition on their meat has probably influenced both sides of this belief. Thus we see the *nāga* as both hostile and protective.

⁷³⁵ Vin. I, pp. 219-220.

⁷³⁶ *Ibid.* p. 219.

⁷³⁷ T. XXII, p. 868b.

⁷³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 149a; T. XXII, p. 868b. When the Theravāda *vinaya* mentions snakes in general, it uses the word *ahi*, but in those cases mentioning a snake king or an object of worship, the Pali words *nāga* is used.

⁷³⁹ *Ibid.* p. 486c; T. XXIV, p. 5a.

⁷⁴⁰ AGS, II, 1.9-10.

The Pali *Bhesajjakkhanda* prohibits consuming the meat of wild beasts of prey.⁷⁴¹ Hindu *Dharma Sūtra* also define carnivorous animals as *abhakṣya*, forbidden food (see chapter 4).⁷⁴² The *Gautama Dharma Sūtra* prohibits consuming “animals with five nails with the exception of the hedgehog, hare, porcupine, Godha monitor lizard, rhinoceros, and tortoise; animals with teeth in both jaws.”⁷⁴³ This definition of the *Gautama Dharma Sūtra* could include the five wild animals that the Pali *Bhesajjakkhanda* mentions. The Pali text states that if monks eat the flesh of beasts of prey such as lions, tigers, panthers, bears and hyenas, those animals will end up attacking the monks.⁷⁴⁴ Schmithausen, in his article entitled ‘A Note On The Origin of Ahimsa,’ observes that in Hindu texts there are many accounts of animals taking revenge on a person who killed one of their kind.⁷⁴⁵ For example, the *Maitrāyaṇi Saṃhitā* states,

When you kill or harm a living being, they should revenge you with the same or similar type of methods.⁷⁴⁶

A re-evaluation of sacrifice is seen in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*:

The sacrificial victims which are mercilessly killed kill the killer with wrath, remembering the agony imposed by the killer.⁷⁴⁷

A number of brahminical texts thus seem to confirm Schmithausen’s suggestion that the emerging concern with vegetarianism was a consequence of a shift from a worldview based on sacrifice to one based on karmic consequences in the broader sense.⁷⁴⁸ This seems to be reflected in the rule on eating carnivores in Buddhism.

⁷⁴¹ Vin. I, p. 220.

⁷⁴² Olivelle 2002: 346.

⁷⁴³ GDS. 17.27-28. Translation Olivelle 2002: 347

⁷⁴⁴ Vin. I, p. 220.

⁷⁴⁵ Schmithausen 2000b: 257.

⁷⁴⁶ MS. 3.1.8.

⁷⁴⁷ BhP. 4. 28. 26.

⁷⁴⁸ Schmithausen 2000: 253-282.

Religious practitioners in ancient India performed their religious practice in solitary places such as the jungle, and it would not be rare that they fell prey to carnivores. The prohibition in the Pali *vinaya* against consuming the five carnivores seems to be a kind of search for protection from wild animals, rather than a response to the routine use of such meats. The background stories of the prohibition on the meat of lions, tigers, panthers, bears and hyena in the Pali *Bhesajjakkhanda* states that those wild animals would kill the monks who ate their relatives.⁷⁴⁹

Kieschnick sums up the reasons for the prohibition of eating the flesh of ten animals thus: “In all of these prohibitions against eating particular types of animals, the fear was of the social or physical repercussions for monks.”⁷⁵⁰ Heirman and De Rauw give a brief but more detailed explanation that accurately reflects the evidence I have brought together above to give a fuller account:

Eating human flesh is the worst offence. It needs no explanation. Human beings just cannot be eaten.

The reason for not eating horses and elephants is that these animals are very precious and belong to the king’s army (T.1425, T.1428, T.1435, T.1448, Vin) or that their meat has a bad smell and is impure (T.1421).

Snakes/*nāgas* (*long 龍*, snake-like beings who live in the sea and the rivers, cf. Nakamura 1985 [1981]: p. 1422) cannot be eaten out of respect and fear for these magical beings and their *nāga* king (T.1421, T.1425, T.1428, T.1435, T.1448, Vin).

The ban on other meat is mainly explained by the fact that the animals involved, knowing that monks and nuns can eat them, might very well attack these clergy members (T.1421: lions, tigers, panthers, bears and dogs; T.1425: dogs, crows, vultures; T.1428: dogs; Vin: lions, tigers, panthers, bears and hyenas).

Another reason is that some kinds of meat are the meat of disrespectful low caste people. By eating it, the monks and nuns lose the respect of the rich lay donors (T.1425: elephants, horses; T.1435: elephants, horses, snakes, and more explicitly dogs (186b3–17)).

⁷⁴⁹ Vin. I. p. 220.

⁷⁵⁰ Kieschnick 2005: 188.

Finally, the Pāli *vinaya* considers dog flesh to be disgusting without giving further explanation.⁷⁵¹

Shimoda, focusing on human flesh, elephant meat, horse meat, and snake meat amongst the ten prohibited meats, classifies the reasons for their prohibition of meats into four: 1) by virtue of logical demand, 2) by virtue of governmental authorities, 3) by virtue of folk beliefs regarding snakes, and 4) by virtue of the relation of the *varṇa* system. He also suggests that, since the lists in Buddhist *vinaya* do not coincide when it comes to the meat of dogs and carnivorous animals, the prohibition of these meats must have been established after the division into these different Buddhist schools.⁷⁵²

To conclude our examination of the ten prohibited meats in the *Bhesajjakkhanda* of the Pali *vinaya* I shall summarise what we have uncovered. Firstly, as the religion was based on high standards of morality, the Buddhist Sangha could not ignore the gravity of consuming human flesh, which was criticised by ordinary people at that time. The bans on elephant and horse meat seem to relate to those animals' value and also to the relationships with royal authorities, who could be a danger, and with potentially influential lay followers and donors. The attitude to dog meat seems to be connected to a social belief concerning impurity. The dog was commonly related to the lowest class, *caṇḍāla* and socially connecting the Buddhist Sangha to dog meat and the *caṇḍāla* could have caused serious problems for maintaining the Buddhist Sangha. The prohibition on snake meat seems to be connected to popular folk beliefs held at that time concerning snakes as both dangerous and potential benefactors. The prohibition on meat of the five beasts of prey seems to have been out of concerns about potential revenge and thus was a safety measure for the monks themselves who, potentially in close proximity to such animals, needed to live in harmony with them. However, we have also seen another

⁷⁵¹ Heirman and Rauw 2006: 61.

⁷⁵² Shimoda 1989: 13.

aspect for the prohibition of each meat in other *vinaya*. Each type of meat is prohibited for a different reason. The reasons are related to notions of impurity, practical concerns relating to the animals, fears of revenge and social expectations and taboos. It seems that Indian societal customs and in particular brahminical views concerning *abhakṣya* foods were influential in the selection of some of the meats to be prohibited.

5-3-2-2. Conditional permission for meat and fish that are pure in three ways (*tikoṭiparisuddhaṃ macchamaṃsam*)

The regulation of the three kinds of pure meat allows for meat-eating in pre-Mahāyāna monastic texts, with the exception of the ten meats prohibited for case-specific reasons. In this section, we explore this regulation and how it is different from others.

5-3-2-2-1. Meat and fish that are pure in three ways

Given Buddhism's concern with compassion and karmic consequences, as well as its sensitivity to the expectation of renunciators in general, which we saw in Chapter 3 and 4, we can understand how vegetarianism may have been a consideration in early Buddhism. The texts confirm this, suggesting that it was indeed a debate within the Sangha from the time of the Buddha. His position on meat-eating, i.e. his acceptance of it in general, with the exceptions of the meats identified in the previous section, was challenged both inside and outside the Sangha.

The famous challenge to meat-eating from within the Sangha came from Devadatta, the cousin of the Buddha who in the texts represents rivalry and jealousy,

and who may in fact have led a separate sect. According to the account in the Pali *vinaya*, Devadatta suggested five extra rules for the Sangha to follow, one of which advocates vegetarianism. The five extra rules he proposed are as follows:

1. Monks should live in the forest their entire lives. If they enter villages, it will be an infringement of the rule.
2. Monks should take alms-food till their last day. If they accept invitations from laity, it will be an infringement of the rule.
3. Monks should wear clothes thrown away till their last day. If they receive clothes from wealthy people, it will be an infringement of the rule.
4. Monks should live under trees till their last day, if they go to houses with a roof, it will be an infringement of the rule.
5. Monks should not consume fish and meat till their last day. If they ingest fish and meat, it will be an infringement of the rule.⁷⁵³

These five extra rules are related to the daily life of monks and propose a more ascetic way of life than that required of the Buddhist Sangha at that time. Only two of the rules in this version of the five extra rules found in the Pali *vinaya*, mention food: the second, restricting the acquisition of food to the alms round rather than the more comfortable option of accepting one's entire meal from a single donor by invitation, and the fifth, excluding meat and fish from the diet. The three other rules concern accommodation and clothing. However, the versions of the five extra rules attributed to Devadatta found in two of the other *vinayas*, focus far more on food, restricting also the use of dairy and salt.

The Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* enumerates the five extra rules proposed by Devadatta as follows:

1. One should not consume salt.
2. One should not consume butter milk.
3. One should not consume fish and meat.

⁷⁵³ Vin. II, p. 197. Author's translation.

4. One should consume only alms food.

5. One should stay outdoors for 8 months in summer; at a monastery for 4 months in winter.⁷⁵⁴

In the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* the five extra rules proposed by Devadatta are:

1. One should not consume milk and curd.

2. One should not consume fish and meat.

3. One should not consume salt.

4. One should not tear up clothes donated by the laity, but rather wear it as given.

5. One should stay at a room in a village.⁷⁵⁵

All versions agree that Devadatta insisted that monks should abstain from meat-eating and follow strict vegetarianism. In response to Devadatta's demand, the Buddha expresses his position that monks may eat meat and fish if they observe the regulation of "meat and fish that are pure in three ways." This specifies that the fish or meat should not have been prepared specifically for the monk, meaning the animal should not have been slaughtered for the monk's sake. So meat and fish are 'pure in three ways' if monks have not seen, heard or suspected that the meat was prepared, i.e. the animal was killed, for them.⁷⁵⁶

The Buddha also used this line of argument in response to a challenge concerning vegetarianism that came from outside the Sangha. A former Jain follower, General Sīha, who had converted to Buddhism, invited the Buddha and monks for alms-food. At this, many Jains criticized the Buddha, claiming he knowingly ate meat which had been killed on purpose for him.⁷⁵⁷ For, while receiving food on an alms round would seem to ensure that the monks are receiving food not prepared specifically for them, and non-vegetarianism could reduce the burden on the lay person to provide something specially prepared, the acceptance of invitations would

⁷⁵⁴ T. XXII, p. 164a.

⁷⁵⁵ T. XXIV, p. 149b. The Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* says that the reason for staying in a room at a village is so as not to abandon a place which lay followers have donated.

⁷⁵⁶ Vin. II, p. 197.

⁷⁵⁷ Vin. I, p. 237.

seem to imply that food would be prepared specially for them, i.e. animals killed for that food would be killed for the monks' sake. So, in response to this criticism, the Buddha confirms that monks should not knowingly accept fish or meat killed for their benefit, and that fish and meat are only allowed if they are pure in the three ways. (*anuñāmi tikoṭiparisuddhaṃ macchamaṃsam addiṭṭhaṃ asutaṃ aparisaṅkitaṃ ti*).⁷⁵⁸ In these two cases in the *Mahāvagga* and the *Cullavagga*, the Buddha declares explicitly that if the three conditions are met, meat-eating is allowed.⁷⁵⁹

The Pali, the Dharmaguptaka, the Mahīśāsaka, and the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* include the rule that fish and meat may be eaten if pure in the three ways (*tikoṭiparisuddhaṃ*). The three ways relate to seeing, hearing and suspecting. Regarding the term *parisuddhaṃ*, Shimoda suggests that this remark presupposes that meat is impure and these four *vinaya* established this rule as the Buddhist response to attitudes in society towards notions of purity and impurity.⁷⁶⁰ He observes that the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* does not use the term *parisuddhaṃ* but the word *akalpika* (inappropriate).⁷⁶¹ The term *parisuddhaṃ* is not used in the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya* either.⁷⁶² Shimoda gives an example of the usage of the words 1) *śuci* and 2) *śuddha* in *Manusmṛti* in which even prohibited meat becomes purified (*śuci* or *śuddha*) and permissible to eat in times of hardship such as famine. He thinks that the logic of the granting of permission to eat meat in Buddhist *vinaya* is on a par with the attribution of purity on meat in the *Manusmṛti*. In other words, he thinks that even though meat is impure, purity is assigned to it on the basis of the three conditions being met. The

⁷⁵⁸ Vin.I. p. 238. The Dharmaguptaka: T. XXII. pp. 871a-872b; the Mahīśāsaka: T. XXII. p. 148c; the Sarvāstivāda: T. XXIII. p. 190 a-c.

⁷⁵⁹ Vin. I. pp. 237-238; T. XXII. p. 149c; T. XXII. p. 871a-871b; T. XXIII. 190 a-c.

⁷⁶⁰ Shimoda 1989: 9.

⁷⁶¹ *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, Gilgit Manuscript vol.3, part 1, p. 237 cited Shimoda 1989: 8.

⁷⁶² T. XXII. 486a. The word *akalpika* (inappropriate) is used here.

statement is a declaration of purity of something that is otherwise or has previously been impure.⁷⁶³

Olivelle defines the Hindu concept of the *abhojya* (unfit food) as follows:

*Abhojya ... refers to food that is normally permitted but due to some supervening circumstances has become unfit to be eaten. These lists contain not food sources but food that is actually served as a meal. Thus, food contaminated by hair or insects, food touched by an impure man or woman, food given by a person from whom food cannot be accepted, food that has turned sour or stale are all abhojya.*⁷⁶⁴

The regulation of the meat and fish that are pure in three ways and that of *abhojya* are not exactly the same, but we can see that they apply a similar logic. Just as food that is otherwise fit for eating becomes unfit by contamination, so fish and meat that avoid the three contaminating factors identified, becomes, through the lack of contamination, fit to eat.

Unlike the regulation of the *abhojya* which includes not only meat but also other foodstuffs such as vegetables, milk, milk products and so on, the regulation of meat and fish that are pure in three ways is related solely to fish and meat. It seems that the regulation, that animals should not have been killed expressly to feed monks, a fact known by monks having not seen, nor heard of nor suspected that to be the case, is made out of consideration for animals, who feel pain and grief. We can confirm this through the Buddha's remark in the *Jīvaka Sutta*, *Majjhima Nikāya* 55. In the *sutta*, the Buddha explains the problems of killing animals to feed him and his disciples, breaking down the process of killing into five components:

- A. Saying, 'Go and fetch that living being.'
- B. Leading [it] along with a neck-halter.
- C. Saying, 'Go and slaughter that living being'
- D. Slaughtering.

⁷⁶³ Shimoda 1989: 10.

⁷⁶⁴ Olivelle 2002: 346.

E. Providing the Buddha and his monks with such food – all these are not permissible.⁷⁶⁵

Although I suggested that there was a similarity in the logic of the concepts of purity and contamination between Buddhist *vinaya* and Hindu *dharmaśāstra* in relation to what was labelled as pure and impure, there is a key difference. In the Hindu application of the label *abhojya*, food becomes unfit food to eat mainly due to external factors. The *Gautama Dharma Sūtra* remarks as follows:

Food into which hair or an insect has fallen; what has been touched by a menstruating woman, a black bird, or someone's food; what has been looked at by an abortionist or smelt by a cow; food that looks revolting; food that has turned sour, except curd; recooked food; food that has become stale, except vegetables, chewy or greasy foods, meat, and honey; food given by someone who has been disowned by his parents, a harlot, a heinous sinner, a hermaphrodite, a law enforcement agent, a carpenter, a miser, a jailer, a physician, a man who hunts without using the bow or eats the leftovers of others, a group of people, or an enemy, as also by those listed before a bald man as people who defile those alongside whom they eat; food prepared to no avail; a meal during which people sip water or get up against the rules, or at which different sorts of homage is paid to people of equal stature and the same homage is paid to people of different stature; and food that is given disrespectfully.⁷⁶⁶

Here external sources of contamination, based on social taboos and hierarchies of purity, make the food *abhojya*.

In contrast, in the labelling of meat as fit for consumption if pure in three ways, the factor decisive in marking the divide between purity and impurity is the consciousness of the monk receiving the food: does he have reason to believe that the animal was killed for him? Did he hear or see any of the five components of slaughter happening? Does he suspect he may have done? The source of purity, the removal of contamination, is internal. The monk is responsible for whether the food he eats is

⁷⁶⁵ MN. I. p. 371. Adapted translation Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 314.

⁷⁶⁶ GDh. 17.9-21. Translation Olivelle 2002: 346.

pure. He must ensure that he does not have a direct connection, does not act as an agent in the killing of animals which are served to him as a meal.

The three kinds of ways in which food for a monk must be pure is presented differently in *Majjhima Nikāya* 55. This *sutta* appears to presume the existence of the regulation of fish and meat that is pure in three ways without mentioning it. Rather, the purity of meat forms only one of a different list of three kinds of purity. Food should be pure in three ways: 1) the food is pure, 2) the eater (monk) is pure, and the donor is pure. What is meant by purity of food is then made clear in terms of the three conditions under which meat-eating is allowed. Then the Buddha explains what is meant by the other two kinds of purity. Firstly, a monk is pure if his attitude to the food is as follows:

Then the householder or householder's son serves him with good food. He does not think: 'How good that the householder or householder's son serves me with good alms food! If only a householder or householder's son might serve me with such good food in the future!' He does not think thus. He eats that almsfood without being tied to it, infatuated with it, and utterly committed to it, seeing the danger in it and understanding the escape from it.⁷⁶⁷

Majjhima Nikāya 53 gives more detail about the right attitude to food on the part of a monk:

Reflecting wisely, a noble disciple takes food neither for amusement nor for intoxication nor for the sake of physical beauty and attractiveness, but only for the endurance and continuance of this body, for ending discomfort, and for assisting the holy life, considering: 'thus I shall terminate old feelings without arousing new feelings and I shall be healthy and blameless and shall live in comfort.'⁷⁶⁸

Returning to the Buddha's account, given in *Majjhima Nikāya* 55, as to how food is pure in three ways, we find that the lay follower is impure, accumulates demerit, if he is involved in any of the five components in the process of slaughter identified earlier:

⁷⁶⁷ MN. I. p.369. Translation Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 313.

⁷⁶⁸ *Ibid.* p. 355. Translation Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 304.

- A. Saying, 'Go and fetch that living being.'
- B. Leading [it] along with a neck-halter.
- C. Saying, 'Go and slaughter that living being'
- D. Slaughtering.
- E. Providing the Buddha and his monks with such food – all these are not permissible.⁷⁶⁹

While here the Buddha advises against lay people being involved in the slaughtering of animals to feed him and his monks, it would seem from elsewhere that procuring meat by other means did not earn demerit in this way. This is implicit in the story of Suppiyā, the woman who donated some flesh from her thigh to make broth for an ill monk after her servant was unable to buy meat because that day was one on which animal slaughter was prohibited.⁷⁷⁰ This implies that it would have been normal and acceptable for her to buy meat with which to make the broth for the sick monk. This has implications, of course, for the type of ethics being applied here: the view in mind appears to be in the involvement in killing, not the extended links with killing indirectly, so a form of virtue rather than consequentialist ethics. This Buddhist attitude to meat-eating is in stark contrast with that of later Jainism.

As we have seen in the *Jīvaka sutta*, (MN 55), the Pali *vinaya*, for the most part, does not prohibit particular kinds of food, nor food offered by particular people, unlike the Hindu regulations concerning *abhojya*.⁷⁷¹ Even meat eating is allowed,

⁷⁶⁹ MN. I. p. 371. Adapted translation Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 314.

⁷⁷⁰ Vin. I. pp. 216–218. The Pali *vinaya* does not mention the reason why the servant could not obtain meat, but other five major vinayas mention that the day was one on which slaughter was prohibited. Mahīśāsaka: T. XXII. p. 48c; Dharmaguptaka: T. XXII. p. 868c–869a; Mahāsāṃghika: T. XXII. p. 468a–b; Sarvāstivāda: T. XXIII. p. 185c; Mūlasarvāstivāda: T. XXV. p. 4a–b.

⁷⁷¹ Understanding the Jaina approach to food is essential for understanding early Indian attitudes to food. Paul Dundas (1992:177) mentions that early Jain ascetics accepted meat-dishes on the same terms that Buddhist monks would, and that they were not strict vegetarians. The *History of Vegetarianism and Cow Veneration in India* states the debate on meat-eating by the Mahāvīra and a scholar such as Kapadia opposes the opinion that the Mahāvīra was meat-eater and he accepts the remark on the Jain texts about meat-eating by the Mahāvīra as metaphors (Bolle 2010: 13). Dundas (2000: 102) further remarks that strict vegetarianism in Jainism is the development after the 8 C.E by Haribhadra in the *Aṣṭakaparakaraṇa*. The Jaina commentator, Hemacandra (cited in Dundas 2000: 102), states that meat is

subject to three desirable factors, purity of food, eater and donor. Cases of meat-eating are commonly mentioned in the *Bhesajakkhandha* in the Buddhist *vinaya* without it being seen a problematic. Buddhist lay followers invite the Sangha to their houses and they frequently treat them to meat-dishes. In the *Bhesajakkhandha*, a chief minister invites the Buddha and Sangha and feeds them meat-dishes with various other foods.⁷⁷² We already saw the case of General Sīha doing so.⁷⁷³ Thus Buddhism provides a regulation concerning meat that deals with the intention of the monk, the recipient of the food, placing the emphasis, as we find elsewhere in early Buddhism, on intention.⁷⁷⁴ This means that, as Schmithausen writes, Buddhist attitudes to abstention from killing or harming living beings “remains within the limits of practicability.”⁷⁷⁵

5-3-2-3. Meat use seen in Pali *vinaya*

prohibited not only because animals are killed but also because many microscopic beings are killed too. The following works contribute to our understanding of early Jain attitudes meat-eating and vegetarianism:

1. Albrecht Wezler, *Die wahren 'Speiseresteesser' (Skt. vighasæśin)*, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur 1978.
2. Ludwig Alsdorf, *The History of Vegetarianism and Cow-Veneration in India*, London and New York: Routledge 2010.
3. Paul Dundas, 'The Meat at the Wedding Feast: Kṛṣṇa, Vegetarianism and a Jain Dispute', in Joseph T. O'Connell (ed.), *Jain Doctrine and Practice: Academic Perspective*, University of Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies 2000, p. 95-112.
4. W.B.Bollée, 'Le Végétarisme défend par Haribhadrasūri contre un bouddhiste et un brahmane', in N.K.Wagle and F.Watanabe (ed.), *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A.K.Warder*, University of Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies 1993, pp. 22-28. (These materials as the references are recommended by my examiner, Prof. Paul Dundas).

⁷⁷² Vin. I. pp. 222-223.

⁷⁷³ Ibid. pp. 236-238.

⁷⁷⁴ We can find this emphasis on intention in various cases in Pali *vinaya* texts. For example, in Buddhist *vinaya*, a person who killed people by setting fire to a forest is stated to be not guilty of the offence of killing because he had no intention to kill. V. III. p. 85.

⁷⁷⁵ Schmithausen 1991: 29.

The *Bhesajjakhandha* mentions food repeatedly, allowing us to identify a great number of foodstuffs consumed in ancient India. Cases of meat-eating are also found there, as already mentioned. In the table below, I summarise examples of meat offerings mentioned in the *Bhesajjakhandha*.

Type of food	consumer	donor
1. Animal tallow (bear, fish, alligator, swine and donkey) ⁷⁷⁶	the Buddha and monks	not mentioned
2. Raw swine flesh and blood ⁷⁷⁷	an ill monk	not mentioned
3. Meat-broth ⁷⁷⁸	an ill monk	not mentioned
4. Human flesh ⁷⁷⁹	an ill monk	Suppiyā (lay woman)
5. Animal meat (elephant, horse, dog, snake, lion, tiger, panther, bear and hyena) ⁷⁸⁰	monks	laity
6. Meat-dishes ⁷⁸¹	the Buddha and monks	a chief minister (lay follower)
7. Meat-dishes ⁷⁸²	the Buddha and monks	General Siha (lay follower)

Table 5.2. Examples of consuming meat or foodstuffs relating to meat in Pali Vinaya

⁷⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p. 200.

⁷⁷⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 202-203.

⁷⁷⁸ *Ibid.* p. 206.

⁷⁷⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 216-218.

⁷⁸⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 218-220.

⁷⁸¹ V. I. pp. 222-223.

⁷⁸² *ibid.* pp. 233-238.

The examples drawn from all the cases in the chapter include food received as part of daily taking alms-food (e.g. 6, 7), as medicine (e.g. 1, 2, and 3) and prohibited meats (e.g. 4 and 5), as well as food received by invitation (e.g. 6 and 7).

Making invitations for monks to come to specially-prepared meals seems to have been very popular among lay people at the time, with lay people providing sumptuous food for the Buddha and his monastic followers. It comes across to us that lay people regarded meat-dishes as the most suitable food for monks since meat was a luxury food item, one with which the laity could show their pious and respectful attitude to the Buddha and monks. We can infer that it was not exceptional for lay followers to treat Buddhist monks to meat-dishes.

The above table shows that both wild and domesticated animals are used for meat-dishes or medicines. Even though they are not common cases, human flesh, raw blood and meat are also reported as being consumed by Buddhist monks. The offering of human flesh led to its prohibition, as did the offering of beasts of prey. We find that, while the Pali *vinaya* allows raw meat, it is prohibited elsewhere.

Shimoda observes varying tendencies toward and against meat-eating among Buddhist *vinaya*. He observes that unlike in the Theravāda and the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*, raw meat is prohibited in the the Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*. He also observes that the five extra rules of Devadatta are accepted by the Haimavata school in its *sūtra*, the *Pinimu jing* (毘尼母經).⁷⁸³ The Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* includes the prohibition on garlic, spring onions and chives which are found in the Mahāyāna *sūtra* representative of *Tathāgathagarbha*. This suggests that the shift towards certain tendencies within Mahāyāna food rules were already developing during the finalisation of some pre-Mahāyāna *vinaya* texts.

⁷⁸³ Shimoda 1989: 13; T. XXIV. No. 1463, the *Pinimu jing* (毘尼母經).

5-3-3. Attitudes to meat in Mahāyāna Buddhism

5-3-3-1. Attitude to meat

Buddhist attitudes to meat-eating take a dramatic turn in Mahāyāna texts. With a couple of exceptions Pali Buddhism mainly discusses the issue of meat-eating within the *vinaya*, not in the *sutta*. However, in Mahāyāna we find ample discussion of it in *sūtra*. The discussion of meat-eating in Mahāyāna *sūtra* deals with doctrinal and meditative issues as well as the precepts on meat-eating. The attitude to meat-eating is considerably more restrictive than that seen in the texts of Pali Buddhism. We can see the example of the complete prohibition of meat-eating in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (入楞伽經 translated by Bodhiruci, 513 C.E):

Mahāmati! Now this *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* says that one cannot eat meat at any time, any kind of meat in any circumstances. Therefore, Mahāmati, when I prohibit eating meat this prohibition applies not just to one person but to everyone in the present and the future.⁷⁸⁴

There is a group of Mahāyāna *sūtras* which prohibit meat-eating, mentioned above when discussing attitudes to dairy. The Chinese translations of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*⁷⁸⁵ (楞伽阿跋陀羅寶經,⁷⁸⁶入楞伽經⁷⁸⁷ and 大乘入楞伽經⁷⁸⁸) mention the titles of these texts: the *Hastikakṣyā Sūtra* (象腋經), the *Mahāmegha Sūtra* (大雲經 or also called 大方等無想經), the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (大般涅槃經),⁷⁸⁹ the *Aṅgulimālīya Sūtra* (央掘魔羅經) and the

⁷⁸⁴ T. XVI. p. 563c.

⁷⁸⁵ There are three Chinese translations of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

⁷⁸⁶ This Mahāyāna text was translated into Chinese by Gunabhadra from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* in 443 A. D. T. XVI. No. 670.

⁷⁸⁷ This Mahāyāna text was translated into Chinese by Bodhiruci from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* in 513 A. D. T. XVI. No. 671.

⁷⁸⁸ This Mahāyāna text was translated into Chinese by Śikṣānanda from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* in 700-704. T. XVI. No. 672

⁷⁸⁹ T. XII. No. 0374; 0375; 0376. There are three versions of Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*:

a. The *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra* (佛說大般泥洹經), translated into Chinese in 418 by Fa xian (法顯).

b. the *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra* (大般涅槃經), translated into Chinese in 421 by Dharmakṣema (曇無讖)

Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra (楞伽經).⁷⁹⁰ Another text that discusses meat-eating, the *Mañjuśrīpariṣcchā Sūtra* (文殊師利問經) also mentions the titles of the texts which prohibit meat-eating chronologically: *Hastikakṣyā Sūtra* (象龜經), the *Mahāmegha Sūtra* (大雲經 also called 大方等無想經), and the *Aṅgulimālīya Sūtra* (指鬘經).⁷⁹¹ There is also the *Mahāyāna vinaya sūtra*, the *Brahmajāla Sūtra* (梵網經盧舍那佛說菩薩心地戒品第十)⁷⁹², which prohibits the consumption of meat and pungent vegetables.

Here we shall return to the most important two texts of those which prohibit meat-eating, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (大般涅槃經) and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (楞伽經). First of all, what is the reason for the change in attitude to meat-eating? We can conjecture the reason on the basis of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*. This text says that even though heretic practitioners preach false doctrines, they prohibit meat-eating, do not eat meat and also ensure that others do not eat meat. In this text, Mahāmāti asks why the Buddha does not prohibit the consumption of meat by monks and others.⁷⁹³ This passage suggests that the change in attitude to meat-eating derives from outside the Buddhist Sangha.

In response, the Buddha replies,

Mahāmāti! My disciples should not eat meat in order to protect the Three Treasures (the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha) from the slander of lay society. What is the reason? When lay people see what monks eat meat, they think that in Buddhism, where are the true śramaṇas and brahmanas who perform pure practice? Abandoning what holy men should originally eat and eating the meat of living beings, it is like that the *rākṣasas* are satiated with meat and sleep drunk without movement.⁷⁹⁴

c. the *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra* (大般涅槃經), translated into Chinese in 436 by Hui yan (慧嚴).

⁷⁹⁰ T. XVI. p. 514 b; the *Mañjuśrīpariṣcchā Sūtra* (文殊師利問經)

⁷⁹¹ T. XIV. p. 493a.

⁷⁹² It is often believed that Kumārajīva translated this text, but there are arguments that it was composed in China. T. XXIII. No. 1484.

⁷⁹³ T. XVI. p. 561a.

⁷⁹⁴ *ibid.* p. 562a.

These remarks could be interpreted as indicating that the Buddhist Sangha encountered criticism from lay people based on their expectations of the behaviour of members of religious groups. Thus, just as *vinaya* rules were laid down concerning food in response to lay expectations of renunciators (see Chapter 3), so now certain Mahāyāna texts also advocate vegetarianism as a response to the more strict dietary behaviour of other renunciators, since if Buddhist monks are seen by lay people as less pure in terms of practice, this will undermine the latter's faith, even if the monks themselves are confident of their superior doctrine. The lay origins of vegetarianism is confirmed in the *Āṅgulināliya Sūtra*.⁷⁹⁵

In the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, Kaśyapa Bodhisattva asks the Buddha the position of the issues about 1) meat and fish that are pure in three ways, 2) the ten prohibited meats and the meat and fish that are pure in nine ways,⁷⁹⁶ and 3) meat and fish as palatable food.⁷⁹⁷ This text asks about all the important issues in relation to meat-eating dealt with by pre-Mahāyāna texts in which meat eating is, in essence, allowed, with some restrictions.

The Buddha answers that ultimately his intention was to prohibit meat-eating. The Buddha says that the previous meat regulations which he had established were enacted according to inevitable circumstances. The Buddha remarks that meat and fish are not sumptuous or palatable food, as the earlier texts record him saying, but confirms that sugarcane, rice, molasses, various grains, black molasses, milk, curd, butter and oil are palatable food.⁷⁹⁸

⁷⁹⁵ T. II, p. 541a.

⁷⁹⁶ X. XI, p. 496a. The commentary of the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* (楞嚴經) explains that there are nine kinds of pure meat and classifies each of the regulations of the three ways in which meat are pure into a further three: for example, the first regulation 'not seen' is divided into 1) Expedient: before killing (seeing someone haul an animal and try to kill it with a knife), 2) Fundamental sin: seeing the actual killing, and 3) later expedient: delighting after the killing.

⁷⁹⁷ T. XII, p. 386a.

⁷⁹⁸ *ibid.*

The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* classifies meat into two kinds: 1) meat obtained as a result of a living being killed by another; 2) meat obtained after a living being dies naturally. The text also mentions a different division into two kinds by lay people: 1) what may be eaten; and 2) what may not be eaten. I list the meats that it enumerates as falling into the latter category in the table below in Table. 5.3. in the second row, with the parallel list of meats prohibited for monastics in the Pali *vinaya* in the first row.

Pali <i>vinaya</i>	human being	elephant	horse	snake	dog
<i>Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra</i>	human being	elephant	horse	snake	dog

Pali <i>vinaya</i>	lion	tiger	panther	bear	hyena ⁷⁹⁹
<i>Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra</i>	dragon	ghost	monkey	pig	cow ⁸⁰⁰

Table. 5.3. Kinds of meat prohibited in Pali *vinaya* and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*

The differences between the kinds of meat prohibited by lay people according to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and those prohibited in the Pali Canon for monks are as follows: 1) the first five kinds of meat are the same in the two lists. From their being placed first, I assume they are regarded as more important than the latter five kinds of meat; 2) *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* does not include the second five kinds of meat, namely the carnivorous beasts of prey, found in the Pali *vinaya*; 3) three beings, dragons, ghosts and monkeys, which seem to relate to folk beliefs, are included in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* as prohibited meat; 4) the meat of pigs and cattle is included in the prohibited meat. Among the kinds of meat prohibited in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the meat which

⁷⁹⁹ Vin. IV. pp. 216-220.

⁸⁰⁰ T. XVI. p. 563c.

draws our attention is the meat of cattle which was defined in the *Dharma Sūtras* as the meat which we can eat.

The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* states that the Buddha prohibits meat-eating because one who slaughters animals does not distinguish between the permitted and prohibited meats but rather slaughters and sells all kinds of animals.⁸⁰¹ The *Mahāparinirvāṇa* and *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* criticize the regulation of meat and fish that are pure in three ways in Pali *vinaya* as essentially allowing meat eating since it only restricts the connection to killing, not to consuming meat. These Mahāyāna texts raise the issue of consequences, namely that the consumption of meat leads to the killing of animals. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* says that the one who purchases meat is to be considered as the same as the one who kills animals:

When it is lack of meat consuming meat, one purchases meat in various places. Merchants kill (animals) in order to earn profit and he kills (animals) for consumers. Therefore one who buys (the meat) is not different from the one who kills.⁸⁰²

The Pali *vinaya* mentions the nine sumptuous food, 1) milk (*khīra*), 2) curd (*dadhi*), 3) fish (*maccha*), 4) meat (*maṃsa*), 5) ghee (*sappi*), 6) oil (*tela*), 7) honey (*madhu*), 8) molasses (*phāṇita*), and 9) butter (*navanīta*).⁸⁰³ In the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* the Buddha permits the using of milk, milk products, molasses, oil and so on but explicitly prohibits fish and meat, and explicitly alters this list to exclude meat and fish, replacing it with a list that includes rice, for example, which was not previously on the list.⁸⁰⁴ The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* further says that when one eats meat and then goes to meet other living beings, they feel fearful due to the smell of meat. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* also remarks that living beings are frightened of the odor of the one

⁸⁰¹ T. XVI. p. 563c.

⁸⁰² *ibid.* p. 563b.

⁸⁰³ Vin. IV. p. 88.

⁸⁰⁴ T. XII. p. 386a.

who eats meat. In addition, this text connects meat-eating with the lowest class in the caste system, the *caṇḍāla*:

Mahāmati! if even though my disciple has heard what I have preached, he does not observe carefully and eats meat, you should know that he belongs to the *caṇḍāla* class, he is not my disciple and I am not his teacher. Therefore, anyone wanting to be my relative should not eat any meat.⁸⁰⁵

The Buddha connects meat-eating to the impure and blameworthy behaviour. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* emphasises meat as impure:

Mahamati! A Bodhisattva should consider all kinds of meat (as follows): all of meat is the impure body which derives from and is harmonized by the pus and blood as impure red and white of the parent. Therefore, the Bodhisattva should observe that meat is impure and he should not eat meat.⁸⁰⁶

The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* teaches Bodhisattva Kaśyapa how to eat alms food in which there is meat by separating and washing it so that the non-meat content can be eaten. He continues:

Even if meat is smeared in the bowl, if the taste of meat does not permeate the bowl, then you can use it without the offence. You should not eat meat which is visible. If you do, then, it is an offence.⁸⁰⁷

In Pali Buddhism, then, monks could eat any alms food which has been offered by lay people, including meat dishes. Now, according to these Mahāyāna texts, monks should carefully remove any meat from his alms food before eating. In the Mahāyāna context the issue of consuming meat is connected with additional regulations or precepts beyond those contained in the *vinaya*, as we can see from the Mahāyāna *Brahmajāla Sūtra*. It includes a list of the offenses in which it divides into two; ten major precepts and forty-eight minor precepts. Consuming meat is the third minor offence.⁸⁰⁸

⁸⁰⁵ T. XVI. p. 561c.

⁸⁰⁶ *ibid.*

⁸⁰⁷ T. XII. p. 386c.

⁸⁰⁸ T. XXIV. p. 1005b.

The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* makes it clear that its attitudes to food, clothes and so on are different from those of Jainism. Having heard the items of prohibition such as the five kinds of flavours (milk, cream, flesh butter, clarified butter and sesame oil), all kinds of clothes, silken cloth, horse-shoe shell, hide and leather, and bowls of gold and silver, the Buddha advises the Bodhisattva Kāśyapa not to confuse Buddhist practice with that of Jains (不應同彼尼乾所見).⁸⁰⁹ In Jainism, butter is strictly prohibited along with meat, alcohol and honey,⁸¹⁰ but in Buddhism, even the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* which has the most strict prohibition against meat-eating, recommends clarified butter as proper food for Bodhisattvas. Jainism strictly prohibits anything which involves the killing of living beings that move.⁸¹¹ The items which Bodhisattva Kāśyapa mentions are directly or indirectly related to the killing of living beings such as silk worms, horse-hoof, hide and leather.

5-3-3-2. Meat Eating and Compassion

Three *Mahāyāna* texts which strictly prohibit meat-eating mention compassion and the compassionate nature of the bodhisattva as the reason for abstaining from consuming meat. The bodhisattva is the ideal being in *Mahāyāna* Buddhism, defined as one who is equipped with wisdom and compassion. In the concept of Bodhisattva, enlightenment is no longer an end for its own sake, rather compassion is the highest ideal one can aim for.⁸¹² Logically, it is not possible for a bodhisattva to kill or harm sentient beings because his essentially compassionate nature responds to the concrete suffering of others.⁸¹³ The *Mahāyāna Brahmajāla Sūtra* states that eating meat

⁸⁰⁹ T. XII, p. 626a.

⁸¹⁰ Williams 1963: 54.

⁸¹¹ *ibid*: 106.

⁸¹² Hamilton 1950: 150.

⁸¹³ Schroeder 2001: 3.

destroys the seed of compassion⁸¹⁴; the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* also states that it kills the seed of great compassion⁸¹⁵ and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* similarly states that it destroys the nature of compassion of the Bodhisattva.⁸¹⁶ For these Mahāyāna sūtra consuming meat is not simply a matter of a minor precept, as seen above both in Mahāyāna *Brahmajāla Sūtra* and in the *vinaya*, but a crucial matter which could prevent a practitioner from becoming a bodhisattva.

5-3-3-3. Attitude to craving for meat

The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* understands that the habit of eating meat started from time immemorial and that living beings have been attached to the flavour of meat ever since.⁸¹⁷ It states that attachment to meat is due to its flavour.⁸¹⁸ It lists the disadvantages of meat-eating. It is difficult for one who eats meat to satisfy his craving and to know the appropriate quantity of food.⁸¹⁹ The text also relates meat-eating to sexual craving.⁸²⁰ It does so while accepting that meat eating enhances physical power:

Meat-eating extends bodily power
 Due to the power, wicked thought is generated
 The wicked thought causes craving
 Therefore, one should not eat meat
 Meat-eating generates craving
 The craving arrives at ignorance

⁸¹⁴ T. XXIV. p. 1005b.

⁸¹⁵ T. XII. p. 626a.

⁸¹⁶ T. XVI. p. 561a.

⁸¹⁷ *ibid.* p. 561b.

⁸¹⁸ *ibid.* p. 562b.

⁸¹⁹ *ibid.* p. 562c.

⁸²⁰ *ibid.*

The ignorance extends lust.⁸²¹

The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* identifies an attachment to the flavour of meat as something that traps one in *saṃsāra*,⁸²² and connects abandoning attachment to it with obtaining enlightenment.⁸²³ In response to food in general, it says that food is like pus and blood: when we eat food, we should not do so for enjoyment but merely because it is necessary for maintaining the body: food should be considered like medicine that is applied to wounds.⁸²⁴ As we shall see in Chapter 6 this approach to food whereby it must be considered as an impure bodily substance like pus and blood is also found in the Mahāyāna versions of the meditation on the loathsomeness of food, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, which is remarkably different from the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* found in Pali Buddhism.

5-4. Conclusion.

This chapter has focused on the inclusion and exclusion of meats in early Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism. We saw how in the *vinaya* meat is allowed, as long as the monks and nuns eating it were not party to its slaughter in any way. Such meat is labelled as ‘pure’ in a way reminiscent of Hindu categories of what may and may not be eaten. Thus the decision depends on agency and the maintenance of the monastics’ virtue or purity of intention. This rule is established in the context of food by invitation since, while alms food can be made up of leftovers and given as a result of chance encounters, the food for invitations is prepared especially for the monks invited. At the level of the *vinaya*, while the seeking out and requesting of meat and dairy products, which were considered to be high-quality, sumptuous foods, was

⁸²¹ *Ibid.* p. 564b.

⁸²² *Ibid.* p. 561b.

⁸²³ *Ibid.*

⁸²⁴ *Ibid.* p. 562b.

prohibited unless one needed them for medical reasons, their consumption, if given, was not. On the other hand, specific lists of up to ten kinds of prohibited meats are found in the *Bhesajjakkhanda*. Examining this list revealed that there were different reasons for their prohibition, from responding to social notions of purity, to avoiding both damage to military equipment (elephants and horses) and annoyance to rulers, to fear about revenge on the part of meat-eating animals and serpents. Within Mahāyāna sūtra we see a change in which meat eating of any kind becomes prohibited, even if received on the alms round. The focus is thus on agency with entailed consequences (that eating meat after an animal is killed nonetheless causes the killing of that animal), rather than entirely on intention, as well as on impurity. In the earliest discussions the fact that lay people respected renouncers who did not eat meat is a key consideration. In other words, compassion may not have been the initial reason for the introduction of vegetarianism in Mahāyāna. Rather the pressure came from vegetarianism in rival groups who thus received greater respect. We also see in some Mahāyāna sūtra a prohibition on dairy. It is suggested that this prohibition occurs within a Chinese, non-Indian milieu reflecting crucial differences in animal husbandry and attitudes to cattle and milk. We see then that the vegetarianism rejected in Devadatta's proposed additional rules becomes accepted in some of the Mahāyāna sūtra that became popular and highly influential in East Asian monasticism.

Chapter Six

Meditation Practices Related to Food

In the preceding three chapters we looked at attitudes to food that mainly dealt with the practicalities of day to day life, i.e. gave regulations on how monks (and nuns) should behave in relation to food. We looked at what monks should and should not do according to *vinaya* rules and the additional precepts found in Mahāyāna *sūtra*. We also noted the optional additional five *dhutaṅga* practices concerning food. These rules and practices addressed modifying external behaviour, the visible response to food. In this chapter we shall turn to texts that seek to address internal responses to food, i.e. the meditations on food that seek to undermine attachment to food and address the problem of craving. There are two meditations most connected with addressing attitudes to food, Contemplation of the Repulsiveness of Nutrition (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*)⁸²⁵ and the Foundation of Mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*).

6-1. The relation between *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* and *kāya-satipaṭṭhāna*

Before exploring these two meditations, it is necessary to discuss the relationship between them, because they have both similar and different functions and different degrees of effectiveness to cope with the craving for food.

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that there are fourteen kinds of practices to establish Body Mindfulness, as follows:

- A. Breathing (breathing in and breathing out)
- B. The four postures (walking, standing, sitting and lying)
- C. Clear awareness (being clearly aware of what one is doing, e.g. eating, drinking, chewing,

⁸²⁵ Hereafter CRN for ‘the Contemplation of Repulsiveness of Nutrition.’

savouring, etc.)

D. Reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body (observance of bodily organs or bodily parts)

E. Review of the Four Elements (reviewing the body as consisting of the earth, water, fire and air elements)

F. The nine charnel-ground contemplations

- a. bloated body
- b. discoloured body
- c. festering body
- d. body eaten by crows, hawks or vultures
- e. body eaten by dogs or Jackals
- f. skeleton with flesh and blood
- g. skeleton detached from flesh and blood
- h. bones whitened
- i. bones rotted away to a powder.⁸²⁶

Three among these fourteen practices of Body Mindfulness – 1) reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body, 2) review of the four elements, and 3) the nine charnel-ground contemplations – relate to *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, which is based on the practice of repulsiveness of objects. There are two kinds of *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* practice in terms of method: 1) the Pali *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* and 2) the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*.

The practice of Body Mindfulness in the Pali *nikāyas* emphasizes the observance of the body. As we have seen above, eleven kinds of the fourteen practices of Body Mindfulness are related to the observance of body. The *Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* mentions three kinds of consecutive observances of body: 1) observance of the internal body (reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body), 2) observance of the four elements (review of the four elements), and 3) the

⁸²⁶ DN. II. pp. 292-298, translation Walshe 1995: 335-339.

observance of the external body (the nine charnel-ground contemplations).⁸²⁷ This emphasis on the consecutive observance of body is also seen in the *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* of the *Majjhima nikāya* 10.⁸²⁸

The Chinese *Āgamas* also record a similar pattern of ‘reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body.’ The *Madhyama Āgama* 81 and 98⁸²⁹ and the *Ekottara Āgama* 98⁸³⁰ mention the three kinds of consecutive observances of body in the same way as the Pali *nikāyas*, although in the practice of the ‘review of the elements’, the Pali *nikāyas* mention the review of four elements, namely, earth-, water-, fire- and air-elements, whereas the two Chinese *Madhyama Āgama sūtra* mention six elements: the earth-, water-, fire-, air-, space- and consciousness-elements.⁸³¹

On the purpose of the ‘reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body’ the Pali *nikāyas* and the Chinese *āgamas* say that this practice is to observe that our body is not what we should be attached to because it is filled with impure things. It is said in the *Samyukta Āgama* that this practice results in our sense organs being protected so that we can control our mind. The text further mentions that through this practice, when the eye sees visual objects, it does not attach to the colours and shapes, and therefore our mind is not defiled with worldly desire, attachment and wicked and unwholesome things.⁸³²

The ‘reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body’ practises the image of repulsiveness through the observance of 32 bodily parts, organs, bodily

⁸²⁷ DN. II. pp. 293-297, translation Walshe 1995: 337-339.

⁸²⁸ MN. I. pp. 57-59.

⁸²⁹ T. I. p. 556a; p. 583b.

⁸³⁰ T. II. p. 568a.

⁸³¹ T. I. p. 556a; p. 583b. The *Dīgha Nikāya* 22 and *Majjhima Nikāya* 10, and the *Madhyama Āgama* and the *Ekottara Āgama* describe the three consecutive observances of body, but the *Samyukta Āgama* 1165 mentions solely the observance of the internal body, namely, the ‘reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body.’ T.II. p. 311a-b.

⁸³² T. II. p. 311b.

fluids and excrement as follows:

A monk reviews this very body from the soles of the feet upwards and from the scalp downwards, enclosed by the skin and full of manifold impurities: “In this body there are head-hairs, body-hairs, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bones, bone-marrow, kidneys, heart, liver, pleura, spleen, lungs, mesentery, bowels, stomach, excrement, bile, phlegm, pus, blood, sweat, fat, tears, tallow, saliva, snot, synovial fluid, urine.” Just as if there were a bag, open at both ends, full of various kinds of grain such as hill-rice, paddy, green kidney-beans, sesame, husked rice, and a man with good eyesight were to open the bag and examine them, saying: “This is hill-rice, this is paddy, this is green gram, these are kidney-beans, this is sesame, this is husked rice”, so too a monk reviews this very body: “in this body there are head-hairs,...Urine.”⁸³³

It seems that CRN (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*) in Pali Buddhism is based on this practice.⁸³⁴ It observes not bodily parts, organs, etc. but mainly the change of food inside the body in the process of digestion. We shall discuss in detail *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali Buddhism in a later part of this chapter. On the other hand, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna accepts and practises the methods of this practice and of the nine charnel-ground contemplations in Body Mindfulness:

A monk, as if he were to see a corpse thrown aside in a charnel-ground, one, two or three days dead, bloated, discoloured, festering, compares this body with that, thinking: “This body is of the same nature, it will become like that, it is not exempt from that fate.” So he abides contemplating body as body internally, externally and both internally and externally. And he abides independent, not clinging to anything in the world. And that, monks, is how a monk abides contemplating body as body. ‘Again, a monk, as if he were to see a corpse in a charnel-ground thrown aside eaten by crows, hawks or vultures, by dogs or jackals, or various other creatures, compares this body with that, thinking: “This body is of the same nature, it will become like that, it is not exempt from that fate.” ‘Again, a monk, as if he were to see a corpse in a charnel-ground thrown aside, a skeleton with flesh and blood, connected by sinews, ... a skeleton detached from the flesh and blood, connected by

⁸³³ DN. II. pp. 293-294, translation Walshe 1995: 337.

⁸³⁴ Vism. p. 347. The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that through the practice of repulsiveness of undigested food, Body Mindfulness is achieved. T. XXV. p. 232b. the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra* (大智度論) replaces the explanation of the contemplation of impurity (*asubha saññā*) with the explanation of impurities of the body from the Body Mindfulness.

sinews,...randomly connected bones, scattered in all directions, a hand-bone here, a foot-bone there, a shin-bone here, a thigh-bone there, a hip-bone here, a spine here, a skull there, compares this body with that...'Again a monk, as if he were to see a corpse in a charnel-ground, thrown aside, the bones whitened, looking like shells..., the bones piled up, a year old..., the bones rotted away to a powder, compares this body with that, thinking: "This body is of the same nature, will become like that, is not exempt from that fate."⁸³⁵

This *asubha* practice shall also be dealt with in detail in this chapter.

It seems that the Pali *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* inherits 'D', the practice of 'reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body' in Body Mindfulness, but does so by examining the change of the state of food induring the process of digestion. The Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* practices follow the practices of 'D' and the 'F' in Body Mindfulness.

To sum up, we can say that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* is a practice which belongs to Body Mindfulness as one of 14 practices. In Pali tradition, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* has become an independent subject of meditation as one of the forty meditation subjects, whereas the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna tradition functions as a component of a meditative subject. We shall examine these themes in detail later in this chapter.

6-2. The Contemplation of Repulsiveness in Nutrition (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*)

6-2-1. The *saññā* practice before the *Visuddhimagga*

The Pali *nikāyas* record four accounts of *saññā* contemplation, in each of which the meditation on repulsiveness of food is one component. The four consist of 5, 7, 9 and 10 *saññā* respectively. For example, the contemplation of 10 *saññā* has the

⁸³⁵ DN. II. pp. 295-29, translation Walshe 1995: 338-339.

following components:

- (1) the contemplation on foulness (*asubhasaññā*), (2) the contemplation on death (*marāṇasaññā*), (3) the contemplation on repulsiveness of food (*āhārepaṭikūlasaññā*), (4) the contemplation on non-delight in the entire world (*sabbaloke anabhiratasaññā*), (5) the contemplation on impermanence (*aniccasaññā*), (6) the contemplation on suffering in the impermanent (*anicce dukkhasaññā*), (7) the contemplation on non-self in what is suffering (*dukkhe anattasaññā*), (8) the contemplation on abandoning (*pahānasaññā*), (9) the contemplation on dispassion (*virāgasaññā*), and (10) the contemplation on cessation (*nirodhasaññā*).⁸³⁶

In the *Āgama* and *Ekottara Āgama*, there are three accounts of *saññā* contemplation, listing 7, 9 and 10 *saññā* practices. In Mahāyāna, there is only mentioned a single ten *saññā* contemplation.

As well as varying in number, the different bodies of literature attribute different benefits to the same *saññā* practices. Table 6.1 gives some indications of this variety.

	Pāli canon	Visuddhimagga	Āgamas	Mahāyāna
Types of <i>saññā</i>	5 <i>saññās</i> ⁸³⁷ 7 <i>saññās</i> ⁸³⁸ 9 <i>saññās</i> ⁸³⁹ 10 <i>saññās</i> ⁸⁴⁰	1 <i>saññā</i> as an independent meditative subject ⁸⁴¹	5 <i>saññās</i> ⁸⁴² 7 <i>saññās</i> ⁸⁴³ 9 <i>saññās</i> ⁸⁴⁴ 10 <i>saññās</i> ⁸⁴⁵	10 <i>saññās</i> ⁸⁴⁶
Merits of practising <i>saññā</i>	leading to detachment, lack of greed,	hindrances are suppressed, his mind is	removing the whole of defilement, obtaining	eliminating gluttony, lust, etc. ⁸⁵⁵

⁸³⁶ Translation Vajirañāna 1962: 64-65.

⁸³⁷ AN. III. p. 79, p. 83; SN. V. pp. 129-131, p. 345.

⁸³⁸ AN. III. p. 46.

⁸³⁹ DN. III. pp. 289-290.

⁸⁴⁰ AN. V. p. 105.

⁸⁴¹ Vism. p. 341.

⁸⁴² T. I. p. 51b.

⁸⁴³ T. I. p. 11c, p. 52a, 54b, 546b.

⁸⁴⁴ T. I. p. 56c.

⁸⁴⁵ T. II. p. 780a.

⁸⁴⁶ T. V. p. 12a; T. XII. p. 588a; T. XXV. p. 229a.

	cessation, tranquility, wisdom, enlightenment and Nirvana, ⁸⁴⁷ cessation of defilements, ⁸⁴⁸ the deliverance of the mind and deliverance of wisdom. ⁸⁴⁹ leading to deathless and have the deathless as the one's final end. ⁸⁵⁰ leading to deathless and have the deathless as the one's final end. ⁸⁵¹	concentrated in Access Concentration (<i>upacāra samādhi</i>), he escapes from craving for flavours, he completely understands his greed for the five senses, he fully understands material aggregate by the complete understanding of five sense desire. ⁸⁵²	enlightenment and gradually arrive at <i>nirvāṇa</i> . behaving without defilement. being able to arriving at the realm of <i>nirāṇa</i> . ⁸⁵³ delivering from the mind with defilement. ⁸⁵⁴	removing the Three Poisons like lust. ⁸⁵⁶ removing desires. ⁸⁵⁷ removing ten obstacles. ⁸⁵⁸ support attaining <i>nirāṇa</i> . ⁸⁵⁹ discriminating the wholesome and the unwholesomeness, ultimately obtain nirvana. ⁸⁶⁰
--	--	---	--	---

Table 6.1. Types of and the benefits of the *saññā* in various Buddhist texts

The *Visuddhimagga* says that attachment to food may cause obstacles that hinder the

⁸⁵⁵ T. XXV. p. 217c.

⁸⁴⁷ AN. III. p. 83.

⁸⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁸⁵⁰ AN. IV. p. 387.

⁸⁵¹ AN. V. p. 106.

⁸⁵² Vism. p. 347.

⁸⁵³ T. II. p. 780a.

⁸⁵⁴ *ibid.* p. 780b.

⁸⁵⁶ T. XXV. p. 217c.

⁸⁵⁷ *ibid.*

⁸⁵⁸ T. XXX. p. 437a.

⁸⁵⁹ T. XII. p. 588a.

⁸⁶⁰ *ibid.*

pursuit of religious ideals. Therefore, it is said that it is indispensable for monks to realize how much food they should consume, and how they control their sense organs in performing pure religious practices and attaining meditative goals.

The *Majjhima Nikāya* and the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* recommend the practice of CRN meditation in order to increase our understanding of the appropriate intake of food and how to avoid indulging in the flavour of food.⁸⁶¹ A Sri Lankan scholar monk says that, “The main goal of this meditation is to eliminate the greed and sensual excitement which may be caused by food, and to free the mind from physical attachment.”⁸⁶²

The method of CRN meditation is mentioned in early Pali texts such as the *nikāyas*. In the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, it is enumerated as a component of ten contemplations (*saññā*) with an external object as a meditative subject.⁸⁶³ These ten contemplations are listed along with the four *jhāna*, the four *brahma-vihāra*, the four bases of mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*), the four efforts (*sammappadhāna*), the four bases of psychic powers (*iddhipāda*), the five faculties (*indriya*), the five powers (*bala*), the seven constituents of enlightenment (*bojjhanga*), the noble eightfold path (*ariya aṭṭhangika magga*), the eight stages of release (*vimokkha*), the eight spheres of mastery of control (*abhibhāyatana*), the ten devices (*kaṣiṇa*), the six recollections (*anussati*) and the four mindfulnesses (*sati*). Thus, the CRN meditation is enumerated as one of 101 subjects of meditation in the *nikāya* texts.⁸⁶⁴

The Pali Abhidhamma texts do not mention CRN meditation in their meditative systems. For instance, the *Dhammasaṅgani*, does not mention CRN meditation in its meditation list, which consists of the four *jhānas*, the eight *kaṣiṇa*, the eight objects of mastery (*abhibhāyatana*), the first three stages of release (*vimokkha*),

⁸⁶¹ MN. I. p. 354; III. pp. 2ff; AN. I. pp. 113ff.

⁸⁶² Vajirañāṇa 1962: 56.

⁸⁶³ AN. I. pp. 34-40.

⁸⁶⁴ Vajirañāṇa 1962: 58-66.

the four *brahma-vihāra*, the ten *asubha*, and the four *arūpa-jhānas*.⁸⁶⁵

The CRN meditation is also mentioned in the *Vimuttimaggā*, which is considered as the source for composing the *Visuddhimaggā*.⁸⁶⁶ Although extant only in Chinese, it is believed to have been composed in Pali and have been available to Buddhaghosa. The seventh chapter of the *Vimuttimaggā* mentions the thirty eight meditations in which the CRN meditation is included. The other items in the list are the eleven *āyatana*, the ten impurity *saññā*, the ten recollections, the four *brahma vihara*, penetrating the four elements, and the four *arūpa-jhāna*. These meditation subjects are taught as objects on which a practitioner may concentrate the mind and which should be selected according the disposition of the individual.⁸⁶⁷

The *Visuddhimaggā* systematised meditation into a system of forty meditation subjects. In this text, the CRN meditation is listed as one of the forty meditative subjects. The others in the list are the ten *kasiṇa*, the ten *asubhas*, the ten *anussati*, the four *arūpa-jhāna*, the analysis of the four physical elements and the analysis of the four elements (*dhātuvavatthāna*).⁸⁶⁸

However, the CRN meditation had undergone various changes in formation with other *saññā* practices before it came to be established as the only meditative method concerning food among the forty meditative subjects. By and large, CRN meditation is enumerated along with contemplation of impurity (*asubha saññā*) and contemplation of death (*marāṇa saññā*) and it is listed as one of a series of *saññā* meditations. Among the Pāli *nikāyas*, the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* frequently mentions meditations on *saññā*. Among the groups of meditation in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, the simplest form of the practice is the group which contains five *saññā*, but the complete

⁸⁶⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 68-70; Ds. pp. 166-264.

⁸⁶⁶ The Pali *Vimuttimaggā* text is lost and only the Chinese translation of the *Vimuttimaggā* is extant, T. XXXII (解脫道論).

⁸⁶⁷ T. XXXII. p. 411a.

⁸⁶⁸ *Vajirañāṇa*, p. 71, 1962.

list is not the same on each occasion. For example, this list is given in the *Āsavakkhaya Sutta* as follows:

There are another five Dhammas. Namely, the five which lead to liberation. The first is to contemplate that body is impurity; the second, to contemplate that food is impure; the third, to contemplate that the world is not enjoyable; the fourth, to contemplate that all phenomena are transience; the fifth, to contemplate death.⁸⁶⁹

The second occurrence of the group of five is in the *Āsavakkhaya Sutta* as follows:

(1) impurity, (2) death, (3) dangers, (4) repulsiveness in nutriment, (5) detachment from the whole world⁸⁷⁰

The third case of the group of five is in the *Āsavakkhaya Sutta* as follows:

(1) impermanence, (2) non-self, (3) impermanence, (4) repulsiveness in nutriment, (5) detachment from the whole world.⁸⁷¹

The fourth case of the group of five is in the *Dāghāvu Upāsaka Sutta* of the *Samyutta Nikāya* as follows:

(1) painfulness of that which is transitory, (2) non-self of that which is suffering, (3) avoidance (4) non-attachment, (5) cessation⁸⁷²

The fifth case of the group of five is in the *Tathāgatādi Sutta* of the *Samyutta Nikāya* as follows:

(1) skeleton, (2) a worm-infested corpse, (3) a discoloured corpse, (4) a fissured corpse, (5) a swollen corpse.⁸⁷³

These five cases contain fifteen different *saññā* in total:

⁸⁶⁹ AN. III. p. 83. The Chinese version of the *Dīrgha Āgama* contains a group of five *saññā* contemplations which includes the same *saññā* meditations but the order of the five *saññā* contemplations has some variation: 1. contemplation of impurity, 2. contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment, 3. contemplation of impermanence, 4. contemplation of detachment from the whole world, and 5. contemplation of death, T. I. p. 51b.

⁸⁷⁰ AN. III. p. 79.

⁸⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷² SN. V. p. 345.

⁸⁷³ *Ibid.* pp. 129-131.

- (1) contemplation of impurity
- (2) contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment
- (3) contemplation of detachment from the whole world
- (4) contemplation of non-self of that which is suffering
- (5) contemplation of avoidance
- (6) contemplation of dangers
- (7) contemplation of non-attachment
- (8) contemplation of cessation
- (9) contemplation of impermanence
- (10) contemplation of death
- (11) contemplation upon skeleton
- (12) contemplation upon a worm-infested corpse
- (13) contemplation upon a discoloured corpse
- (14) contemplation upon a fissured corpse
- (15) contemplation a swollen corpse

The texts mentioned above point out that when these groups of five contemplations are cultivated, they lead to detachment, lack of greed, cessation, tranquility, wisdom, enlightenment and Nirvana.⁸⁷⁴ When we cultivate these contemplations, it leads to the cessation of defilements.⁸⁷⁵ Furthermore, the practice of the contemplations could bring the fruit of the deliverance of the mind, the merit of the fruit of the deliverance of the mind, the fruit of the deliverance of wisdom and the merit of the fruit of the deliverance of wisdom.⁸⁷⁶

Generally, the groups of seven contemplations are formed by adding another two *saññās* – the contemplation of suffering of that which is transitory and the contemplation of non-self of that which is suffering – to the group of five contemplations which consists of (1) impurity, (2) repulsiveness in nutriment, (3)

⁸⁷⁴ AN. III. p. 83.

⁸⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p. 84.

detachment from the whole world, (4) death, (5) impermanence.⁸⁷⁷

The CRN meditation is explained as one of seven contemplations in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* :

What are the seven Dhammas? The first is to contemplate that our body is impure; the second, food is impure; the third, the world is not enjoyable; the fourth, to memorize the perception of death at all times; the fifth, to think of all phenomena as transient; the sixth, to contemplate all phenomena as transitory and suffering; the seventh, to contemplate all phenomena as suffering and not substantial.⁸⁷⁸

The notable characteristic of these groups of seven contemplations is that they have almost the same contemplations, but the titles of the seven contemplations in each group vary between the Chinese versions of the texts.⁸⁷⁹ The Chinese *Āgamas* title the groups of seven contemplations as follows:

- (1) The seven vitalizing *dharma*: contemplation of impurity, contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment, contemplation of detachment from the whole world, impermanence, contemplation of impermanence, contemplation of suffering of that which is transitory, contemplation of non-self of that which is suffering.⁸⁸⁰
- (2) The seven *dharma*: the same.
- (3) The seven contemplations: the same except for the contemplation of nothingness, which is equivalent to the contemplations of death in other groups of seven.
- (4) The seven contemplations for practices for deliverance: the same, but this group expresses the contemplation of repulsiveness of nutriment as the

⁸⁷⁷ AN. IV. p. 46.

⁸⁷⁸ *Ibid.* These are the Chinese versions of equivalent contemplations for the passage from the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*: T. I. p. 11c; p. 52a; p. 54b.

⁸⁷⁹ In the Pali texts, the seven *saññā* are titled in two ways; the Seven Contemplations and the Seven *dhamma*. See, AN. IV. p. 46 and p. 148.

⁸⁸⁰ T. I. p. 546b.

contemplation of non-detachment to food and in this group, the last contemplation is termed as the contemplation of suffering being eternal.

The aim of practising seven contemplations is almost the same as that of the group of five, but the characteristic purpose of performing the seven contemplations is for understanding attachment to objects.

In most cases, the group of nine contemplations is formed by adding yet another two *saññā* – the contemplation of avoidance and the contemplation of non-attachment – to the group of seven contemplations which consists of (1) impurity, (2) repulsiveness in nutriment, (3) detachment from the whole world, (4) impermanence, (5) impermanence (6) the contemplation of suffering of that which is transitory, (7) the contemplation of non-self of that which is suffering.

The CRN meditation is contained as one of nine components in the group of nine contemplations in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and the *Dirgha Āgama*:

What are vitalizing nine Dhammas? There are nine contemplations: contemplation of impurity, contemplation of penetrating food, contemplation of the world not being enjoyable, contemplation of death, contemplation of transience, contemplation of temporariness and suffering, contemplation of suffering and selflessness, contemplation of cessation and contemplation of the greedless.⁸⁸¹

The *Dasuttara Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* adds the concentration of extinguishing feeling and perception (*nirodha-samāpatti*, 滅盡定) to the group of nine to make ten.⁸⁸² The fifty-seventh *sutta* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* contains a set of another ten contemplations which includes *asubha* contemplations:

- (1) contemplation of impermanence
- (2) contemplation of non-self
- (3) contemplation of death
- (4) contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment

⁸⁸¹ AN. IV. p. 387; T. I. p. 56c.

⁸⁸² DN. III. p. 290.

- (5) contemplation of detachment from the whole world
- (6) contemplation upon skeleton
- (7) contemplation upon a worm-infested corpse
- (8) contemplation upon a discoloured corpse
- (9) contemplation upon a fissured corpse
- (10) contemplation a swollen corpse.⁸⁸³

The *Ekottara Āgama* explains the reason why a set of the ten contemplations is practised as follows:

If you cultivate the ten contemplations, the defilements cease, you attain, penetrate to and become enlightened. Gradually you approach Nirvana. What are the ten? They are contemplations on the skeleton, on a discoloured corpse, on a swollen corpse, on undigested food, on blood, on chewing, on permanence and impermanence, on greed for food, of death and of the world not being enjoyable. Thus, *Bhikkhus*, if you cultivate these ten contemplations, you will remove the defilements and can attain Nirvana.⁸⁸⁴

This group of ten contemplations includes two kinds of *saññā* meditation: the meditation on a corpse (*asubha*) and that of external objects or phenomena.

As we have seen above, the contemplation of repulsiveness of nutriment has continuously changed in its formation with other *saññā* in the early Pali *nikāya* and the *āgama* literature, and the contemplation of repulsiveness of nutriment has been positioned as one of many *saññā* which functions as a meditative method for eliminating greed for food.

6-2-2. The *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali Buddhism

6-2-2-1. The contemplation of repulsiveness of nutrition (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*)

⁸⁸³ AN. V. p. 106.

⁸⁸⁴ T. II. p. 780a.

As we have seen earlier in this chapter, the practices of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* have been mentioned in the Pali *nikāya*, but its role there was as a component of collective *saññā* practices (i.e. the 5, 7, 9 and 10 groups of *saññā*). The Pali *nikāyas* do not provide detailed information about the practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* except for the name of the practice.

However, the Pali commentarial text, the *Visuddhimagga*, explains how to practise the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in detail. The *Visuddhimagga* has established this practice as one of the forty meditative subjects in Theravāda Buddhism. The *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the *Visuddhimagga* has become an independent meditative subject, unlike in the Pali *nikāyas*, the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna.

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* achieves the practice of Body Mindfulness through the image of the repulsiveness of undigested food and so on,⁸⁸⁵ whereas we already know that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna directly relates to the observance of impurity in our bodily parts, organs and secretions through the practice of Body Mindfulness (*kāya satipaṭṭhāna*). Even though the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the *Visuddhimagga* inherits the tradition of repulsiveness related to bodily impurity from the practice of the Body Mindfulness, it is not exactly the same method of the repulsiveness of bodily parts, organs and excrement as in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna.

We can say that the Pali, Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna traditions have the same purpose and object of the practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, but their method of practice is not the same.

The *Visuddhimagga* says that food makes us attached to it and we should eat food with the attitude that we eat for no other reason than for maintaining our

⁸⁸⁵ Vism. p. 347.

body.⁸⁸⁶

The *Visuddhimagga* remarks that we should practise the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* through the ten aspects of repulsiveness of food. This is the method through which we observe the change of state of food, through the stages of 1) before eating, 2) digesting, and 3) excrement.

6-2-2-2. The result and the limitation of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that the practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* results in the following:

1. The craving for flavour of food is subdued.
2. The five sensual desires are fully understood.
3. Understanding the material aggregate.
4. Achieving the practice of the Body Mindfulness through repulsiveness of undigested food.
5. Entering on the path of the perception of impurity.
6. Being born in wholesome destiny.⁸⁸⁷

However, the *Visuddhimagga* also mentions that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* only leads to access concentration (*upacāra samādhi*), which is a pre-stage of absorption concentration (*appanā samādhi*).⁸⁸⁸ The *Visuddhimagga* remarks on the status of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in its meditation system as follows:

eight recollections (*anussati*) except “the mindfulness occupied with body (*kāyagatāsati*)” and “mindfulness of breathing (*ānāpānasati*)”, “the perception of repulsiveness in nutrition (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*) ” and the analysis of the four physical element (*catudhātuvavatthāna*), these ten meditative subjects result in access concentration (*upacāra samādhi*).⁸⁸⁹

As we have seen above, from the position of *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the meditative

⁸⁸⁶ Vism. p. 341.

⁸⁸⁷ *Ibid.* P. 347.

⁸⁸⁸ *Ibid.* p. 69.

⁸⁸⁹ *Ibid.* p 90.

system in Pali Buddhism, this meditation also has limited efficacy in removing the craving for food. The result of the practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* is not to remove the craving for food but to subdue it. The function and limitation of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* will be dealt with in more detail in the section on *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna.

6-2-2-3. The ten aspects of repulsiveness in the practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*

The aim of the practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* is to recognize the repulsiveness of food. The *Visuddhimagga* says that the repulsiveness of food should be reviewed in ten aspects with the application of thought (*vitakka*) and sustained thought (*vicāra*).

Thought *vitakka* is to direct the mind toward an object, and *vicāra* is to sustain the mind on the object. These two mental factors are frequently mentioned as *samādhi* factors in the first *jhāna*.⁸⁹⁰ The *Visuddhimagga* emphasizes that *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* should be repeatedly practised, and then the obstacles caused by food are subdued.⁸⁹¹

The *Visuddhimagga* provides the most detailed information on the cultivation of CRN. It states that one who seeks to cultivate CRN should contemplate repulsiveness in material food in ten aspects. These ten aspects have significant implications concerning the viewpoint of the nature of material food and the adaptation of our sense organs to view repulsiveness in nutriment. The *Visuddhimagga* describes the first aspect of food repulsiveness as follows:

A. The first repulsive aspect: as to going.

In the description of the first aspect of food repulsiveness, the *Visuddhimagga*

⁸⁹⁰ MN. I. p. 174; p. 181; p. 204; III. p. 4.

⁸⁹¹ Vism. p. 347.

describes in detail a process of generating repulsiveness for obtaining food, reflecting on loathsome objects at each stage of going to a village for obtaining food.

As regards going (for alms-food): In the morning, he must leave behind the ascetics' woods that are not crowded with people, offer the bliss of seclusion, and he must set out for the village in order to get nutriment, as a jackal for the charnel ground.

And as he goes thus, he has to tread on a carpet covered with the dust of his feet, geckos' droppings, and so on. Next he has to see the doorstep, which is more repulsive than the terrace above since it is all smeared with the droppings of owls, pigeons, and so on. Next the grounds, which are more repulsive than the lower floor since they are defiled by old grass and leaves blown about by the wind, by sick novices' urine, excrement, spittle and snot, and in the rainy season by water, mud, and so on. And he has to see the road to the monastery, which is more repulsive than the grounds

In due course, after standing in the debating lodge when he has finished paying homage at the Enlightenment Tree and the shrine, he set out thinking, 'Instead of looking at the shrine that is like a cluster of pearls, and the Enlightenment Tree that is as lovely as a bouquet of peacock's tail feathers, and the abode that is as fair as a god's palace, I must now turn my back on such a charming place and go abroad for the sake of food; and on the way to the village, the view of a road of stumps and thorn and an uneven road broken up by the force of water awaits him

Next, when he reaches the vicinity of the village gate, perhaps the sight of an elephant's carcass, a horse's carcass, a buffalo's carcass, a snake's carcass, or a dog's carcass, awaits him, and not only that but he has to suffer his nose to be assailed by the smell of them.

Next, as he stands in the village gateway, he must scan the village streets in order to avoid danger from savage elephants, horses, and so on.⁸⁹²

The first repulsive aspect in material food in the *Visuddhimagga* demonstrates two characteristics of CRN: one is a stark contrast between the two places which on the one hand promote peaceful and pleasant states and on the other are associated with

⁸⁹² *Ibid.* pp. 342-343.

repulsiveness and impurity; the other is the description of a gradual increase of repulsiveness regarding material food. This is a salient contrast with the CRN in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna traditions which fundamentally exclude the scene of the sensory aversion as we shall see later.

As for the structure of the contrast in this first aspect, the first paragraph above describes the place for meditation, as “being not crowded with people and offering the bliss of seclusion.”⁸⁹³ The third paragraph describes, “the shrine and the Enlightenment Tree are like a cluster of pearls and is as lovely as a bouquet of peacock’s tail feathers respectively and the abode is as fair as a god’s palace.”⁸⁹⁴ This text implies that without the connection to obtaining food, the places where *bhikkhus* stay and cultivate meditation are the opposite of repulsive. These descriptions of ideal and pleasant places function to accentuate the repulsiveness of food whether it is connected directly or indirectly. The *Vimuttimaggā*, which was compiled before the *Visuddhimaggā* and based on which the *Visuddhimaggā* has been composed, has a similar structure of contrast between the places relating to obtaining alms and the places irrelevant to searching for food.⁸⁹⁵

It seems that the contrast between the two places is quite similar in the two texts. The *Vimuttimaggā* describes the places irrelevant to obtaining food as possessing the beauties of nature and being ideal places to achieve religious aims, by saying that “fragrant flowers bloom, where birds sing, the cry of the wild is heard, and the ground is flat and exceedingly clean; so there is nothing uneven” and “in such a place the mind is unfettered; and he, reciting (the Law) and developing concentration always, enjoys the practice of good deeds.”⁸⁹⁶ We can recall the *Shiji jing* (世記經) from chapter one where descriptions such as ‘the water’s cleanness and the evenness of ground’, is

⁸⁹³ *Ibid.* p. 342.

⁸⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹⁵ T. XXXII. p. 440c.

⁸⁹⁶ *ibid.*, translation Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 206.

used to indicate the ideal place in which food exists in ideal conditions, i.e the food does not have repulsiveness.⁸⁹⁷ Here, the structure of the story is divided into the two places where there is not food (ideal condition) or where there is food (repulsive condition).

On the other hand, the description in the *Visuddhimagga* of the places related to the repulsiveness in obtaining food is more confined to religious places such as the place for meditation, the shrine and the Enlightenment tree. There does not seem to be significant differences between the descriptions in the two texts, but it does have some significance that the *Vimuttimaggā* interprets that the problems caused by seeking food are related not only to the sensory repulsiveness of obtaining food, but also to religious, ethical and sensory loathsomeness concerning procuring food.

The second characteristic described last in each paragraph, on the other hand, portrays the places related to seeking for food as having increasing repulsiveness:

- a. Carpet (the dust of his feet, gecko's dropping and so on)
↓
- b. Doorstep (the droppings of owls, pigeons and so on)
↓
- c. Grounds (old grass and leaves, sick novice's urine, excrement, spittle, snot and water, mud, etc. in the rainy season)
↓
- d. Road to the monastery (more repulsive than the grounds)
↓
- e. On the way to the village (stumps, thorn and uneven road)
↓
- f. The vicinity of the village gate (the sight and smell of an elephant's, horse's,

⁸⁹⁷ T. I, p. 118a.

buffalo's, snake's, or a dog's carcass)



g. Village gateway (the danger from savage elephants, horses, and so on)

As we shall see in the others of the ten aspects of repulsiveness of food, the explanation of the first aspect of CRN in the *Visuddhimagga* focuses more on the aspects of repulsiveness concerning obtaining food. As a manual for cultivating CRN, the *Visuddhimagga* shows the most detailed method to remove the appetite to food and to review repulsiveness while taking alms, focusing on the aspect of loathsomeness concerning obtaining food.

The *Visuddhimagga* focuses more on repulsiveness concerning food itself. The *Vimuttimaggā*, however, mentions other problems caused by obtaining food in addition to encountering repulsiveness while going to obtain food:

This religious practitioner sees that sentient beings encounter trouble in searching for food; they commit many evil deeds such as killing and theft. Further he sees that these sentient beings receive various forms of suffering and are killed or fettered. Again, he sees that such sentient beings commit diverse evil actions such as eagerly searching for things, deceiving and pretending to be energetic. Thus these sentient beings perform evil.⁸⁹⁸

The text mentions the evils caused by obtaining food as follows:

- a. Immorality: killing, theft, and deceiving
- b. Inhumanity: people are killed and fettered
- c. Impurity: urine, excrement, treading on mud and passing the places of dogs and pigs
- d. Danger and difficulty: passing the places where fierce horses and elephants are gathering, standing silently begging for food at other's houses.⁸⁹⁹

In addition to 'impurity' and 'danger and difficulty', which are also enumerated in the *Visuddhimaggā*, the *Vimuttimaggā* offers the problems of 'a. immorality' and 'b.

⁸⁹⁸ T. XXXII. p. 440 b, translation adapted from Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 206.

⁸⁹⁹ Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 206-207.

inhumanity.’ In terms of meditative method, these two factors could function as the reasons to strengthen repulsiveness in relation to going for food. On the other hand, these references to immorality and inhumanity, which are more frequently experienced in obtaining food in secular society for the laity, contrast to the *Visuddhimagga*, in which the problem caused by obtaining food presupposes a monastic environment..

The contrast between the places relating to obtaining food and to meditation in the *Visuddhimagga* mainly focuses on whether or not the place is physically pleasant, but the *Vimuttimaggā* contrasts the two against other standards.

Here are no quarrels and noises. This place where the monks train for enlightenment is like the dwelling of Brahma. In such a place the mind is unfettered; and he, reciting (the Law) and developing concentration always enjoys the practice of good deeds.⁹⁰⁰

In the passages of the first repulsive aspect in nutriment in the *Visuddhimagga*, the most loathsome aspect concerns the sight and smell of animal carcasses:

When he reaches the vicinity of the village gate, perhaps the sight of an elephant’s carcass, a horse’s carcass, a buffalo’s carcass, a snake’s carcass, or a dog’s carcass, awaits him, and not only that but he has to suffer his nose to be assailed by the smell of them.⁹⁰¹

Richard J. Stevenson in his work, *The Psychology of Flavour*, mentions that “the two senses [sight and smell] that are primarily involved in the decision to eat food prior to placing it in the mouth are orthonasal olfaction and vision”⁹⁰² and “many decisions about what to eat are made before the potential food ever reaches the mouth.”⁹⁰³ In the *Visuddhimagga* repulsive experiences which are perceived by visual and olfactory senses arouse a sense of repulsiveness in food by connecting the sight and smell of those animal carcasses with obtaining food.

⁹⁰⁰ T. XXXII. p. 440c, translation adapted from Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 206.

⁹⁰¹ Vism. p. 343, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 340.

⁹⁰² Stevenson 2009: 161.

⁹⁰³ *Ibid*: 166.

The *Visuddhimagga* explains the second aspect of CRN in chronological sequence. The first and the second aspects of the meditation for food repulsiveness, i.e. ‘as to going’ and ‘as to seeking’ are equivalent to the stage of ‘searching’ in the *Vimuttimaggā*. The whole sequence of each is shown in the following Table 6.2.

<i>Vimuttimaggā</i>	<i>Visuddhimaggā</i>
1. Searching	1. Going
	2. Seeking
2. Grinding	3. Using
3. Receptacle	4. Secretion
	5. Receptacle
	6. What is undigested
	7. What is digested
4. Oozing	9. Outflow
5. Aggregation	8. Fruit
	10. Smearing

Table 6.2. The repulsive aspects of material food in the *Vimuttimaggā* and the *Visuddhimaggā*⁹⁰⁴

B. The second repulsive aspect: as to seeking.

The *Visuddhimaggā* continues to review the repulsiveness of food with entering a village to obtain food.

⁹⁰⁴ The *Visuddhimaggā* (清淨道論) in Japanese *Nanden Daizokyo*(南傳大藏經) says that the first repulsive aspect in the *Vimuttimaggā* corresponds to the second repulsive aspect in the *Visuddhimaggā*, but this is not correct because the first repulsive aspect in the *Vimuttimaggā* explicitly includes what the first and second repulsive aspects in the *Visuddhimaggā* mention. Therefore, the first repulsive aspect in the *Vimuttimaggā* should be considered as corresponding to the first and second repulsive aspects in the *Visuddhimaggā*. However, the connections of other aspects in the two Pāli texts are by and large correct. The *Nanden Daizokyo*. LXII. p. 247.

He has to wander in the village streets from house to house like a beggar with a dish in his hand. And in the rainy season wherever he treads his feet sink into water and mire up to the flesh of the calves. He has to hold the bowl in one hand with his body covered with the dirt, grass and dust blown about by the wind. On reaching such and such a house door he has to see and even to tread in gutters and cesspools covered with blue-bottles and seething with all the species of worms, all mixed up with fish washings, meat washings, rice washings, spittle, snot, dogs and pigs' excrement, and what not, from which flies come up and settle on his outer cloak of patches and on his bowl and on his head.

And when he enters a house, some give and some do not. And when they give, some give yesterday's cooked rice and stale cakes and rancid jelly, sauce and so on. Some, not giving, say 'Please pass on, venerable sir', others keep silence as if they did not see him. Some avert their faces. Others treat him with harsh words such as 'Go away, you bald-head'. When he has wandered for alms in the village in this way like a beggar, he has to depart from it.⁹⁰⁵

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that the process of taking alms in a village is "repulsive owing to the water, mud, etc., that has to be trodden in and seen and endured for the sake of nutriment."⁹⁰⁶ The concept of repulsiveness which the *Visuddhimagga* expresses includes social indifference, inhospitableness and animosity towards monks. The *Vimuttimaggā* describes this aspect in its first section: "He has to tread on mud or excreta in unclean places. He has to stand at the gates of other's houses, silently, for some time."⁹⁰⁷ Marion M. Hetherington and Barbara J. Rolls in their article dealing with the psychology of food habits mention that even negative experience which is not directly connected to a particular food can nevertheless cause one to reject the food.⁹⁰⁸

C. The third repulsive aspect: as to using.

⁹⁰⁵ Vism. p. 343, Summarized translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 340.

⁹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 342.

⁹⁰⁷ T. XXXII. p. 440c, translation Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 206-207.

⁹⁰⁸ Hetherington and Rolls 1996: 268.

In the third repulsive aspect of material food, the *Visuddhimagga* starts to deal with the aversion to food itself.

After he has sought the nutriment in this way and is sitting at ease in a comfortable place outside the village, then so long as he has not dipped his hand into it he would be able to invite a respected *bhikkhu* or a decent person, if he saw one (to share it); but as soon as he has dipped his hand into it out of desire to eat he would be ashamed to say ‘take some’. And when he has dipped his hand in and is squeezing it up, the sweat trickling down his five fingers wets any dry crisp food there may be and makes it sodden.

And when its good appearance has been spoilt by his squeezing it up, and it has been made into a ball and put into his mouth, then the lower teeth function as a mortar, the upper teeth as a pestle, and the tongue as a hand. It gets pounded there with the pestle of the teeth like a dog’s dinner in a dog’s trough, while he turns it over and over with his tongue; then the thin spittle at the tip of the tongue smears it, and the thick spittle behind the middle of the tongue smears it, and the filth from the teeth in the parts where a tooth-stick cannot reach smears it.

When thus mashed up and besmeared, this peculiar compound now destitute of the (original) colour and smell is reduced to a condition as utterly nauseating as a dog’s vomit in a dog’s trough. Yet notwithstanding that it is like, it can still be swallowed because it is no longer in range of the eye’s focus.⁹⁰⁹

This third repulsive aspect describes the loathsome effect of chewing food, and mixing it with saliva in the mouth. Generally speaking, the most significant part in the description of food in the mouth relates to gustation with tongue, but in terms of repulsiveness of material food in this stage of ingestion, the description of loathsomeness through taste has limitations because the taste which is sensed in the mouth does not necessarily cause repulsion – it could be pleasant. The *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā Śāstra* also comments on the specific roles of sense organs in cultivating

⁹⁰⁹ Vism. p. 344, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 341.

CRN as follows:

The contemplation of impurities (*asubha saññā*, 不淨想) has the visual sphere (*rūpa āyatana*, 色處) as its object because the meditation is practised by application of the visual consciousness. The contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, 厭食想) is the meditation which reviews repulsiveness in material food, therefore it has the smell, taste and contact spheres as its objects. However, some say that the contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment has the visual sphere (*rūpa āyatana*, 色處) as its object because this meditation is also cultivated by application of the visual consciousness.⁹¹⁰

The description of the second repulsive aspect, ‘grinding’ in the *Vimuttimaggā* is also similar to the third repulsive aspect, ‘using’ in the *Visuddhimaggā*:

That monk sees a man who, having searched for and obtained food, sits down in front of these. He makes the (solid food) soft, by mixing it with fish sauce. He kneads it with his hand, grinds it in his mouth, gathers it with his lips, pounds it with his teeth, turns it with his tongue, unites it with his saliva and serum. These are most repulsive and unsightly as the vomit of a dog. Thus one cultivates the Contemplation of Repulsiveness in Nutriment through ‘grinding.’⁹¹¹

In this stage, the repulsiveness of food is caused by destroying the colours and shapes of food and therefore, it can be said that our eye consciousness is related to this aspect of repulsiveness.

D. The fourth repulsive aspect: as to Secretion.

Buddha and Paccekabuddhas and Wheel-turning Monarchs have only one of the four secretions consisting of bile, phlegm, pus and blood, but those with weak merit have all four. So when [the food] has arrived at the stage of being eaten and it enters inside, then in one whose secretion of bile is in excess it becomes as utterly nauseating as if smeared with thick *madhuka* oil; in one whose secretion of phlegm is in excess it is as if smeared with the juice of *nāgabala* leaves; in one whose secretion of pus is in excess it is as if smeared with rancid buttermilk; and in one whose secretion of

⁹¹⁰ T. XXVII. p. 838b. Author’s translation.

⁹¹¹ T. XXXII. p. 440c, translation Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 207.

blood is in excess it is as utterly nauseating as if smeared with dye. This is how repulsiveness should be reviewed as to secretion.⁹¹²

The mention of the four secretions, bile, phlegm, pus and blood mainly relates to the impurity of body as in the case of the Mindfulness of the Body (*kāyagatāsati*) which consists of the thirty-two elements of “bile, phlegm, pus, blood, head hairs, body hairs, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bones, bone marrow, kidney, heart, liver, midriff, spleen, lungs, bowels, entrails, gorge, dung, sweat, fat, tears, grease, spittle, snot, oil of the joints, and urine.”⁹¹³ These bodily secretions are also mentioned in the *Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* 22 in one of the practices of Body Mindfulness.⁹¹⁴

E. The fifth repulsive aspect: as to receptacle.

When it has gone inside the belly and is smeared with one of these secretions, then the receptacle it goes into is no gold dish or crystal or silver dish and so on. On the contrary, if it is swallowed by one ten years old, it finds itself in a place like a cesspit unwashed for ten years. If it is swallowed by one twenty years old, thirty forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, ninety years old, if it is swallowed by one a hundred years old, it finds itself in a place like a cesspit unwashed for a hundred years. This is how repulsiveness should be reviewed as to receptacle.⁹¹⁵

This fifth repulsive aspect describes the repulsiveness in which the stomach is likened to a cesspit. In the *Vimuttimaggā* ‘receptacle’ is the third aspect, and has a similar explanation to that of the *Visuddhimaggā* even though it describes the state very briefly by saying that “Thus these foods are swallowed and go into the stomach mixed with impurities and remain there.”⁹¹⁶

⁹¹² Vism. p. 344, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 341.

⁹¹³ Vism. p. 240.

⁹¹⁴ DN. II. pp. 293-294.

⁹¹⁵ Vism. p. 344-345, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 341-342.

⁹¹⁶ T. XXXII. p. 440c, translation Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 207.

Our sense faculties cannot observe the nutriment from the fourth repulsive aspect to the eighth aspect in the *Visuddhimagga*. When the five sense-organs can not function, we must depend on our imagination of repulsiveness through the sixth sense-organ (*mano-āyatana*). Can that mental sense-organ cause as severe repulsiveness as that by the five bodily sense-organs?

Stevenson mentions that “there seems to be some aversions that wholly depend upon cognition for their formation.”⁹¹⁷ He continues to state that “simply negative information can provoke marked avoidance as can contact with disgust elicitors.”⁹¹⁸ Citing survey data, he points out that “cognitive aversion may be both stronger and more enduring than those generated via flavour-aversion learning.”⁹¹⁹ This means that cognitive aversion (repulsiveness) could be caused by negative information without the contact of bodily sense-organs.

F. The sixth repulsive aspect: as to what is undigested.

After this nutriment has arrived at such a place for its receptacle, then for as long as it remains undigested it stays in that same place just described, which is shrouded in absolute darkness, pervaded by draughts, tainted by various smells of ordure and utterly fetid and loathsome. And just as when a cloud out of season has rained during a drought and bits of grass and leaves and rushes and the carcasses of snakes, dogs and human beings that have collected in a pit at the gate of an outcaste village remain there warmed by the sun’s heat until the pit becomes covered with froth and bubbles, so too, what has been swallowed that day and yesterday and the day before remains there together, and being smothered by the layer of phlegm and covered with froth and bubbles produced by digestion through being fermented by the heat of the bodily fires, it becomes quite loathsome. This is how repulsiveness should be reviewed as to what is undigested.⁹²⁰

⁹¹⁷ Stevenson 2009: 174.

⁹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹²⁰ Vism, p. 345, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 342.

This sixth repulsive aspect depicts the repulsiveness of material food which remains undigested in the stomach and is digested and fermented by the heat of bodily fires. We cannot see the state of food in the stomach, but we can conjecture the repulsiveness inside the stomach through its being reminiscent of this repulsive state in other cases. It could be said that this description of undigested food is also related to cognitive aversion.

G. The seventh repulsive aspect: as to what is digested.

When it has been completely digested there by the bodily fires, it does not turn into gold, silver, etc., as the ores of gold, silver, etc., do (through smelting). Instead, giving off froth and bubbles, it turns into excrement and fills the receptacle for digested food, like brown clay squeezed with a smoothing trowel and packed into a tube, and it turns into urine and fills the bladder. This is how repulsiveness should be reviewed as to what is cooked.⁹²¹

This seventh repulsive aspect describes the repulsive state in which digested food becomes excrement in the intestines and urine. In the *Aggañña Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* 27, the existence of excrement presupposes the excretory and sexual organs, and the problem caused by food generates the problems caused by lust.⁹²² Here, the repulsiveness of food is described by its physical aspect, but it could be extended to moral and social repulsiveness of food as described in the *Aggañña Sutta*. However, the description of repulsiveness in the *Visuddhimagga* is confined to the description of the repulsiveness of material food.

H. The eighth repulsive aspect: as to fruit.

⁹²¹ Vism. p. 345, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 342.

⁹²² DN. III. p. 88.

When it has been rightly digested, it produces the various kinds of ordure consisting of head hairs, body hairs, nails, teeth, and the rest. When wrongly digested it produces the hundred diseases beginning with itch, ringworm, smallpox, leprosy, plague, consumption, coughs, flux, and so on. Such is its fruit. This is how repulsiveness should be reviewed as to fruit.⁹²³

This eighth repulsive aspect describes the repulsiveness which digested foods produce. When food is digested, it produces impurities and when food is undigested, various diseases occur as a result. This eighth aspect in the *Visuddhimagga* corresponds to the last out of five aspects, ‘aggregation’, in the *Vimuttimagga* classification and the descriptions of the two texts are similar:

This drink and food which flow become hair of the head and the body, nails and the rest. They set up one hundred and one parts of the body. If they do not trickle out, they cause one hundred and one diseases. Thus one cultivates CRN through ‘aggregation.’⁹²⁴

This is the last repulsive aspect of food in the *Vimuttimagga*, but the *Visuddhimagga* has two more, which deal with stages before and after excretion. The characteristic of CRN in the *Vimuttimagga* lies in using social (immorality, inhumanity and so on) and sensory (visual, olfactory and cognitive aversion) factors to cause repulsiveness to remove craving for food, whereas that of the *Visuddhimagga* consistently pursues repulsiveness of nutriment mainly through sensory and cognitive aversions (visual, olfactory, tactile and cognitive ones).

I. The ninth repulsive aspect: as to outflow.

In the ninth repulsive aspect of material food, the *Visuddhimagga* describes the repulsiveness of outflow. This deals with repulsiveness concerning before and after excretion.

On being swallowed, it enters by one door, after which it flows out by several doors in the way

⁹²³ Vism. p. 345, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 342.

⁹²⁴ T. XXXII. p. 441a, translation Ehara, Soma and Kheminda 1961: 207-208.

beginning, “Eye-dirt from the eye, ear-dirt from the ear.” And on being swallowed it is swallowed even in the company of large gatherings. But on flowing out, now converted into excrement, urine, etc., it is excreted only in solitude. On the first day one is delighted to eat it, elated and full of happiness and joy. On the second day one stops one’s nose to void it, with a wry face, disgusted and dismayed. And on the first day one swallows it lustfully, greedily, gluttonously, infatuatedly. But on the second day, after a single night has passed, one excretes it with distaste, ashamed, humiliated and disgusted.⁹²⁵

In this stage of repulsive aspect, the *Visuddhimagga* mentions not only sensory repulsiveness of excretion but also an ambivalent attitude to food and excreta which cause attachment and repulsiveness. The recognition of the repulsiveness of food in the *Visuddhimagga* starts from sensory aversion before eating and ends with sensory aversion concerning excretion, via cognitive aversion concerning the state of food in the stomach.

J. The tenth repulsive aspect: as to smearing.

In the tenth repulsive aspect of material food, the *Visuddhimagga* describes the repulsiveness of smearing which accompanies the whole process of food consumption, preparation, digestion and excreting.

At the time of using it he smears his hands, lips, tongue and palate, and they become repulsive by being smeared with it. And even when washed, they have to be washed again and again in order to remove the smell. And, just as, when rice is being boiled, the husks, the red powder covering the grain, etc., rise up and smear the mouth, rim and lid of the cauldron, so too, when eaten it rises up during its digesting and simmering by the bodily fire that pervades the whole body, it turns into tartar, which smears the teeth, and it turns into spittle, phlegm, etc., which respectively smear the tongue, palate, etc.; and it turns into eye-dirt, ear-dirt, snot, urine, excrement, etc., which respectively smear the eyes, ears, nose and nether passages. And when these doors are smeared by it, they never become either clean or pleasing even though washed every day. And after one has

⁹²⁵ Vism. pp. 345-346, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 343.

washed a certain one of these, the hand has to be washed again. And after one has washed a certain one of these, the repulsiveness does not depart from it even after two or three washings with cow dung and clay and scented powder. This is how repulsiveness should be reviewed as to smearing.⁹²⁶

Even though it is said that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali Buddhism inherits the method of the practice of Body Mindfulness which preaches the impurity of the body, it does not solely adopt the method of observance of bodily impurities (such as bodily parts, organs, secretion and so on) but observes the repulsiveness of the change of food state. In this sense, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali Buddhism has a unique method of practice, unlike the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna as we shall see later in this chapter. However, as we have seen above, in the sense of that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali Buddhism partly accepts the method of observance of bodily impurities as described in the tenth repulsive aspect above and it observes the impurity of food, we can say that the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali Buddhism does inherit the method of Body Mindfulness.

6-2-3. The *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the Sarvāstivāda school and Mahāyāna

The Sarvāstivāda treatises mention a significantly different type of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in terms of the method of practising the meditation. From the early *Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra*, to the full-fledged scholarly treatise, the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra*, the Sarvāstivāda texts consistently describe the same type of practice. Mahāyāna has inherited this method.

As we have seen earlier in this chapter, three of the fourteen practices of Body Mindfulness are related to the observance of our inner and outer body as impure, and the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna accept this method of observance as the method of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*.

⁹²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 346, translation Ñāṇamoli 1991: 343.

The *Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra*,⁹²⁷ the earliest Abhidharma text of the Sarvāstivāda, mentions CRN, but its viewpoint is significantly different from that of texts such as the *Vimuttimaggā* and *Visudhimagga*. This text contains two kinds of *saññā* meditations, the five *saññā* meditation and the six *saññā* meditation. The five *saññā* meditation in this text is called ‘the five contemplations of mature deliverance’ and each item is as follows:

- a. contemplation of impermanence
- b. contemplation of suffering of that impermanence
- c. contemplation of non-self which is suffering
- d. contemplation of repulsive and nauseating in nutriment
- e. contemplation of death⁹²⁸

In addition to this five *saññā* contemplation, there is the six *saññā* meditation which simply adds the contemplation of detachment from the whole world.⁹²⁹ The most striking characteristic in this Sarvāstivāda text is the method of cultivation of the meditation concerning the foulness of food. The *Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra* tells how to practise the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* as follows:

Monks should observe material food through the contemplation of impurity.⁹³⁰

It explicitly mentions that one practises the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* through the contemplation of impurity. It seems that this accepts the practices of the impurities from the Body Mindfulness, which includes ‘reflection on the repulsiveness of the parts of the body’ and ‘the nine charnel-ground contemplation.’

Then, how does a practitioner perform the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*? The

⁹²⁷ Hirakawa 1993: 131-132. The Sarvāstivāda abhidharma has seven treatises which are called the ‘Six feet (*pāda*)’ and one ‘body (*śarīra*).’ The *Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra* is one of the six ‘feet’ treatises and this is the earliest *abhidharma* text among the seven. The *Jñānaprasthāna* is considered as the most important text, and this is ‘the body’. These texts were established between the second to the first century B.C.E. and are all extant in the Chinese *Tripitaka*.

⁹²⁸ T. XXVI. p. 423c.

⁹²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 432c.

⁹³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 423c.

Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra explains the method of practice as follows:

What is the process of the meditation?

One should with conviction (*adhimokkha*, 勝解) consider porridge and steamed rice as a swollen dead body.⁹³¹

One should with conviction consider gruel, soup and meat broth as watery stool.

One should with conviction consider buttermilk and curd as bone marrow and brain.

One should with conviction consider butter, oil, molasses and honey as fat of human being.

One should with conviction consider barley flour as bone powder.

One should with conviction consider *chapati* as human skin.

One should with conviction consider salt as broken teeth.

One should consider lotus roots, lotus stalks, vegetables, branches and leaves as connected hair and skeleton.

One should consider juices and drinks as pus and blood.

One should pay attention to material food with the conviction that material food is repulsive and damaging, and observe material food through the contemplation of impurity.⁹³²

The *Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra* observes material food through the impurities of inner and outer body which are mentioned in the practice of the Body Mindfulness. In this practice, the change of the state of food is not the object of observance. The important factor in this practice is to connect food items to bodily impurities which cause the signs of repulsiveness. In this *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, the impurities of inner and outer body are used. It mentions a swollen dead body and bone powder as parts of the outer body and pus, blood, skin and marrow as parts of inner body, as in the practice of the Body Mindfulness.

⁹³¹ When the Pali and the Sarvāstivāda schools mention the practice of *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, they also remark on the mental factors which are associated with various meditative factors. The *Visuddhimagga* (Vism. p. 346) says that two mental factors, *vitaka* (尋) and *vicāra* (伺) accompany the practice of *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*. On the other hand, the Sarvāstivāda text, the *Abhidharma-saṅgīti-paryāya-pāda Śāstra*, mentions that *manasikāra* (作意) and *adhimokkha*, (勝解) function when practising the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*. All of the mental factors are related to ‘paying attention to the object’ and have the function of making our mind recognize the nature of the object. (T. XXVI. p. 423c).

⁹³² T. XXXVI, p. 423c.

This passage juxtaposes food items with elements of our body based on the method of practising the contemplation of impurity. Adopting the same method of the contemplation of impurity for practising CRN shows that the Sarvastivāda school views the nature of the two meditations as the same.

The *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra* explains the differences between the two meditations, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* and the *asubha saññā*. It says that the two differ in their objects. It further states that the aim of the contemplation of impurity is to eliminate sensual lust, but the aim of CRN is to remove greed for food.⁹³³ Regarding the object of the meditations, this text upholds the opinion that these two meditations investigate colours and shapes,⁹³⁴ but there is a criticism of this opinion which points out that the nature of food is related to the spheres of smell, taste and touch (*āyatana*s) and CRN deals with these objects.⁹³⁵

We also find the idea of connecting bodily impurity to the CRN meditation in the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra*. It explains the method of the CRN meditation as follows:

When one obtains cakes during taking alms, one should consider those as human stomach.

When one gets barley flour, one should consider it as flour of bones.

When one obtains salt, one should consider it as human teeth.

When one receives rice, one should consider it as maggots.

When one obtains vegetables, one should consider those as human hair.

When one gets soup, one should consider it as bodily fluid.

When one obtains milk and yogurt, one should consider those as human brains.

When one gets curd and molasses, one should consider those as human fat.

When one obtains fish and meat, one should consider those as human flesh.

When one gets drink, one should consider it as human blood.

When one obtains confection, one should consider those as dried excrement.

⁹³³ T. XXVII, p. 842b.

⁹³⁴ *ibid.*

⁹³⁵ *Ibid.*

When one gets clean grass, eating with the Samgha, one should consider it as human hair.

One should consider a using bed and chair as a pile of bones.

One should practise the contemplation of impurity on food obtained.⁹³⁶

Compared to the method of the CRN meditation in Pali texts , which relates to the adoption of visual, olfactory, tactile, cognitive senses and social situation to view repulsiveness of nutriment, this method is mainly based on cognitive aversion through semantic knowledge, e.g. names of foodstuffs.

The method of the CRN meditation in Pali tradition demands continuous observance of the change of state of food before and after ingestion, but on the other hand, that of the Sarvāstivāda tradition does not need the observance of the change of the state of food, but repeatedly imprints the mind with the repulsiveness of foodstuffs connected to bodily parts, organs, fluids and secretion.

The method of practice of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the Sarvāstivāda is inherited by Mahāyāna. The *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra* (大智度論) describes the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* as follows:

The contemplation of repulsiveness in nutrition is to observe that food is produced from impure stuffs. (In this meditation) one sees that meat is produced from the path of the water of sperm and blood and it is the place where pus and worms live: and butter, milk and curd are produced by the change of blood and they are not different from decomposed pus.⁹³⁷

Why do the two traditions, the Pali and the Sarvāstivāda, have different methods of cultivating the CRN meditation? The *Visuddhimagga* does not define food as something which is pure or impure, but it only mentions that “when there is physical nutriment, there is attachment, which brings perils.”⁹³⁸ The *Vimuttimagga* expresses the viewpoint as follows:

Even food which has various flavours, which pure people cherish, which has colours and flavours,

⁹³⁶ T. XXVII. p. 840a-b.

⁹³⁷ T. XXV. p. 231b.

⁹³⁸ Vism. p. 341.

when it enters inside our body, it becomes impure.⁹³⁹

At least, we can say that the Pali texts do not express the view that food has the property of impurity in its nature, but the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna traditions have a totally different viewpoint of the nature of material food. The *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā Śāstra* in detail explains the nature of food as follows:

A *bhikkhu* should investigate where food derives from in the hands or in the bowl, when he cultivates the Contemplation of Repulsiveness in Nutriment. Having known it comes from grains, he should again look at where the grains originate from. Having understood they derive from seeds in the field, he should again review where the seeds originate from. He comprehends that they originate from excrement and filthy things in the mud. Having understood thus, he should investigate that material food derives from impurity in sequence. Again, food in order produces impurity, how could the wise obsess about food?⁹⁴⁰

This Sarvāstivāda text gives an account that material food originates from impurities, and therefore the food itself has the nature of impurity. The Mahāyāna texts also share this point of view of food as we have seen in Nāgārjuna's *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra*.⁹⁴¹ The difference between the two traditions seems to lie in divergent views of the nature of food.

CRN meditation in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna traditions views material food as originating from impurities. For example, meat is derived from semen and blood and this is the place where pus and bacteria proliferate. Blood changes and produces curd, milk and yoghurt.⁹⁴²

In this viewpoint in which food itself is impurity, it seems that there is no need to observe the repulsiveness of food from the beginning of eating to excrement, but

⁹³⁹ T. XXXII. p. 44b.

⁹⁴⁰ T. XXVII. p. 840a.

⁹⁴¹ T. XXV. p. 231b

⁹⁴² *ibid.*

only the need to imprint the mind with the repulsiveness of food.⁹⁴³ Modern psychology explains food aversion in mainly two ways: 1) sensory aversion and 2) cognitive aversion. The sensory aversion is based on actual experience through sense organs; for example, experience of being poisoned by red berries creates aversion to red berries; and of indigestion after eating fatty food. On the other hand, cognitive aversion involves a negative association in mind, irrespective of direct experience of actual harm; for example, a mother warns her child of poisonous berries and thereafter the son dislikes berries: and the belief that “Pork is impure and dirty” lies behind religious dietary prohibitions. We could define the method of the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna traditions as cognitive aversion which causes repulsiveness through semantic information about foodstuffs. The food psychologist, Richard J. Stevenson, says that cognitive aversion is more powerful and enduring than sensory aversion.⁹⁴⁴

6-3. The Four Foundations of Mindfulness as a countermeasure to craving for food

Of these two meditations, CRN (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*) and the foundation of mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*), Pali Buddhism considers the latter as a fundamental countermeasure to cope with craving for food – the definitive solution to the problem

⁹⁴³ Beside the Pali, and Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna positions, there is a third on the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the *Satyasiddhi Śāstra* (T. XXXII 1646). (誠實論). In this text, we can find the viewpoint and the method of the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna and the Pali as follows :

Question: how should one cultivate the contemplation of repulsiveness in nutriment?

Answer: the nature of this nutriment is impurity, even good flavoured dishes and fruits are all impurities. Therefore one should loathe it. When clean, fragrant, palatable food is pure, it does not benefit the body. Food which is chewed, wetted with saliva is like a vomit and when it enters the organs, it could benefit our body. Therefore one should understand that [food is] impure.

The *Satyasiddhi Śāstra* shows that it has the viewpoint of food similar to that of the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna in which food is considered as impurity. However, the method of observance of impurity of food is similar to that of the Pali tradition.

⁹⁴⁴ Stevenson 2013: 160-168.

is mindfulness.

Pali Buddhist texts frequently mention formulas concerning coping with the craving for food:

Here a noble disciple is possessed of virtue, guards the doors of his sense faculties, is moderate in eating, and devoted to wakefulness.⁹⁴⁵

Monks observe precepts firmly, control sense organs, comprehend moderation in eating and concentrate mindfulness.⁹⁴⁶

First he looks at the door of sense organs, is moderate in eating, and establishes mindfulness all the time.⁹⁴⁷

The citation from the *Majjhima Nikāya* explains the meaning in detail: 1) “A noble disciple is possessed of virtue” means that “he (a monk) dwells restrained with the the *pāṭimokkha*”⁹⁴⁸; 2) “how a noble disciple guards the doors of his sense faculties” means that when he sees visual colours and shapes, he does not attach to the visual colours and shapes. “If he left the eye faculty unguarded, evil unwholesome states of covetousness and grief might invade him. He practices the way of its restraint, he guards the eye faculty, he undertakes the restraint of the eye faculty.”⁹⁴⁹ He should also practice the same in the case of other sense organs like the ear, the nose, tongue, body and mind. 3) What “moderate in eating” means is that “Reflecting wisely, a noble disciple takes food neither for amusement nor for intoxication nor for the sake of physical beauty and attractiveness, but only for the endurance and continuance of this body, for ending discomfort, and for assisting the holy life.”⁹⁵⁰ 4) “How is a noble disciple devoted to wakefulness?” means that “during the day and night, a monk purifies his mind of obstructive states and should be mindful and fully aware, walking,

⁹⁴⁵ MN. I. pp. 354-355, translation Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 303-304.

⁹⁴⁶ AN. III. p. 135.

⁹⁴⁷ AN. I. p. 113.

⁹⁴⁸ MN. I. 355, translation Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 304.

⁹⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁵⁰ Ibid.

sitting, lying, rising.”⁹⁵¹ The two above mentioned citations from the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* mention the establishment of mindfulness.

It is said in the *Visuddhimagga* that sensual lust results from the six sense organs, and the sense organs should be controlled as in the case of Mahā Tissa, the monk who considered a woman as only a pile of bones without any feeling for her beauty.⁹⁵² It is also said that in order to realize sexual attraction for what it is, we should avoid obsession with particular features such as attractive shapes, hands, feet, smiles, laughter, words, front shape, or back shape of the opposite sex. Similarly the craving for the taste of food should be destroyed and the obsession with the quantity of food should also be controlled, because food is the object which causes sensuous desire.

It is also advised that in order to achieve both the destruction of the craving for the taste of food and the control of the obsession with the quantity of food, five *dhutaṅgas* (3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th) among thirteen in the *Visuddhimagga* can be practiced. These deal with the craving for the taste of food and the obsession with quantity of food in terms of the practice of virtue (*sīla*). Furthermore, the practice of the contemplation of repulsiveness of food (*āhārepaṭikūla saññā*) as a kind of “contemplation of impurity (*asubha saññā*)” should be performed to remove the two impediments in terms of meditation (*samādhi*). It is, however, said that the establishing of mindfulness (*satisadhana*) is the fundamental countermeasure to control sense organs in the *Visuddhimagga*:

Controlling of sense organs should be achieved by mindfulness. The controlling of sense organs means the establishment of mindfulness and craving by sense organs is not caused by the establishment of mindfulness.⁹⁵³

⁹⁵¹ *Ibid.* Translation adapted from Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995: 304.

⁹⁵² *Vism.* p. 21.

⁹⁵³ *Ibid.* p.29.

Samyukta Āgama 1171 states why one should cultivate Body Mindfulness to cope with craving caused by our sense organs. This text mentions that practising Body Mindfulness prevents us from being attached to sense objects. The *sutta* likens the six sense organs to six animals: 1) eye (a dog), 2) ear (a bird), 3) nose (a snake), 4) tongue (a fox), 5) body (an alligator), and 6) mind (a monkey). Just as our sense organs have their own sense objects, these animals wish to go to the places they desire: 1) a dog desires to go to a village, 2) a bird desires to fly to the sky 3) a snake desires to enter a hole, 4) a fox desires to go on graves, 5) an alligator desires to go to the sea, and 6) a monkey desires to go to the forest. The Buddha preaches that these six animals are likened to our six sense-organs, and the strong post to which these six animals are tied up, to Body Mindfulness.⁹⁵⁴ The way these six animals desire to go to their favoured place is like the way that our six sense organs seek their pleasant sense objects:

- A. Eye-sense organ always seeks for pleasant visual forms and colours but loathes unpleasant visual forms and colours.
- B. Ear-sense organ always seeks for pleasant sound but loathes unpleasant sound.
- C. Nose-sense organ always seeks for pleasant fragrance but loathes unpleasant smell.
- D. Tongue-sense organ always seeks for pleasant flavour but loathes unpleasant flavour.
- E. Body-sense organ always seeks for pleasant touch but loathes unpleasant touch.
- F. Mind-sense organ always seeks for pleasant object but loathes unpleasant object.⁹⁵⁵

Samyukta Āgama 244 remarks that the heart of the problem is that the sense-organs attach to the sense objects:

There are six hooks of the evil one, what are the six?

When eye is hooked on and attaches to visual forms and colours, this is the hook of the evil one.

When ear is hooked on and attaches to sound, this is the hook of the evil one.

When nose is hooked on and attaches to fragrance, this is the hook of the evil one.

⁹⁵⁴ T. II. p. 313b.

⁹⁵⁵ *ibid.* p. 313a-b.

When tongue is hooked on and attaches to flavour, this is the hook of the evil one.

When body is hooked on and attaches to touch, this is the hook of the evil one.

When mind is hooked on and attaches to mind-objects, this is the hook of the evil one.⁹⁵⁶

Another *Samyukta Āgama sūtra* explains the result of cultivation of Body Mindfulness as follows:

When one cultivates Body Mindfulness skillfully, one does not become attached if one sees pleasant visual forms and colours and one does not loathe them if one sees unpleasant visual forms and colours....Concerning the mind and mind-object, one does not desire to seek for a pleasant mind-object and one does not loath an unpleasant mind-object.⁹⁵⁷

The Sarvāstivāda text, the *Abhidharmayāyānusāra Śāstra* (阿毘達磨順正理論), explains the process of attachment to food as follows:

By what reason are the desire and craving for food generated? Due to food, various pleasant feelings are produced and due to those pleasant feelings, various cravings can be caused. When various cravings have been generated, attachment to those cravings becomes inevitable. Because food is the immediate cause of craving, when craving has been produced, it can be said that food functioned as a requisite. Because of this, it is said that food is the cause of craving.⁹⁵⁸

The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* (瑜伽師地論) explains how not to attach to sense-objects, focusing on the activity of mind and the function of mindfulness:

Through the contact of mind and mental objects, consciousness is generated. This consciousness acts with what is pleasant or what is not pleasant [i.e. to outer sense-objects]. When consciousness causes attachment to what is pleasant or disgust at what is not pleasant, the mind can be protected through the predominant power of mindfulness. It is said that mindfulness protects consciousness because it prevents the defilements from being generated.⁹⁵⁹ ...

How does one protect? One maintains right mindfulness and always and meticulously cultivates right mindfulness. This is to protect. What is to be protected? This is what is protected: the eye

⁹⁵⁶ T. II, p. 58c.

⁹⁵⁷ *ibid.* p. 313b.

⁹⁵⁸ T. XXIX, p. 513a.

⁹⁵⁹ T. XXX, p. 406c.

organ, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind organs. These are to be protected.⁹⁶⁰

The *Visuddhimagga* mentions that the control of our sense-organs is achieved by mindfulness meditation. The text further states:

For that is accomplished by mindfulness, because when the sense faculties' functions are founded on mindfulness, there is no liability to invasion by covetousness and the rest....This [restraint] should be properly undertaken by preventing with unremitting mindfulness any apprehension, in the objective fields consisting of visible data, etc., of any signs, etc., likely to encourage covetousness, etc., to invade consciousness occurring in connection with the eye door, and so on.⁹⁶¹

6-4. Conclusion

To sum up, meditation practices are most essential countermeasures to cope with the craving for food. In this sense, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* and the mindfulness meditations play a pivotal role in removing the craving for food. The *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* plays a role which subdues gluttony, but this does not remove the craving for food. Regarding the method of practising the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā*, there are two kinds, one from the Pali and the other from the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna. These two *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* derive from parts of the Body Mindfulness. The *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in Pali tradition is based on the observation of impurities of our body in the practice of Body Mindfulness, but the method of the meditation is to observe the change of the state of food inside our body. On the other hand, the *āhārepaṭikūla saññā* in the Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna is to imprint into our mind the impurities of foodstuffs through cognitive aversion.

The texts say that the fundamental countermeasure to eradicate craving for food is to practise mindfulness meditation. The essential measure to remove the

⁹⁶⁰ *ibid.* p. 407c.

⁹⁶¹ Vism. p. 36, translation Ñāṇamoli 2010: 36.

craving for food is to control perfectly our six sense organs and to prevent our sense organs to attach to sense objects. The meditation of mindfulness results in controlling the sense organs.

Conclusion

In this thesis I have gathered, collated and analysed narratives, regulations and instructions concerning the consumption of food from six Buddhist *vinayas*, supporting this with reference to other canonical Buddhist texts in both Pali and Chinese. My approach has been that of inter-textual analysis, comparing the various versions of the *Aggañña Sutta* and parallel *vinaya* texts to understand the thinking behind the attitudes to food and the extant food regulations that governed monks and nuns throughout Buddhist history and continue to influence monastic life today. I have also used other, later sources that have thrown light on the earlier *sutta* and *vinaya* texts, including commentaries, treatises, path summaries and meditation instructions. These included *sutta/sūtra* and *abhidharma* commentaries, the *Visuddhimagga*'s chapter on the Repulsiveness of Food, and parallel meditation texts from the Sarvāstivāda tradition. I also examined a variety of evidence in Mahāyāna *sūtras* of different periods, identifying the move towards increasing vegetarianism and how Indian versus Chinese cultural contexts may have influenced the nature of the vegetarianism.

I have sought to examine Buddhism's distinctive attitude to food. This attitude to food is exemplified in the story from the Buddha's life in which he casts aside ascetic fasting and eats: the meal he eats enables his enlightenment. The mendicancy he subsequently establishes, according to the narrative of the first sermon, begins with the early Sangha begging for alms to support their learning and practice. This is represented as a 'middle' way of moderation when compared with other renouncer traditions: it eschews the household life, but also eschews extreme asceticism. The importance of food for the healthy support of the body and mind and hence for the spiritual path is emphasised in multiple *vinaya* passages and *sutta* that mention food. It

is the craving for food which must be avoided: monks and nuns should be indifferent to the flavour, taste and quantities. They should not participate in its production and not place a burden on lay supporters by seeking out specific foods. This means that in early Buddhist texts the first Buddhist precept of ‘non-killing’ is not interpreted as an injunction against eating meat.

Set against this practical moderation we see evidence that some Buddhists retained an ongoing appreciation of more ascetic, negative approaches to food. We also find that lay people’s expectations as to how renouncers ought to behave changed with time, and perhaps also with place. Buddhists regulations and *vinaya* changed to accommodate those expectations. Some of these changes may have even altered the meditation practices that are meant to address the craving for food, principally the ‘meditation on the repulsiveness of food.’

I initially assumed that the primary objective of Buddhist teachings about food and regulations concerning food would mainly be directed at addressing or eliminating craving, the root cause of our suffering, according to the classic fourfold summarisation of the Buddhist teaching in the Four Noble Truths Formula. However, in spite of the significance of the craving for food in the narrative of the origins of corruption in the universe, and in spite of the dedicated ‘meditation on the repulsiveness of food,’ this proved not to be the picture that emerged when examining the literature mentioned above. Rather, we find multiple factors influencing the regulation of food. Whilst craving and clouding of the mind do feature, the primary influences seem to be lay expectations of renouncers in a context where the reliance on lay support led to competition between different groups of renouncers. This proves to be the case even in the early adoption of vegetarianism in Mahāyāna *sūtras*, where we might expect compassion to dominate the debate, as it does later on. Medical justifications are included both in relatively early texts, such as

those where the Buddha advocates eating just one meal a day, and in later texts such as Mahāyāna sūtra and treatises mentioning the benefits for meditation.

I began my exploration of attitudes to food by re-examining the cosmogonic myth found in the Pali *Aggañña Sutta*, related Pali texts, parallel Chinese texts and the commentaries in both Pali and Chinese. Explorations of the ways the *Aggañña Sutta* helps us understand early attitudes to food and of the close relationship between early Buddhist cosmogony and monastic practice form the cores of Chapters One and Two. This relationship had been previously observed by two scholars in particular, Patrick Olivelle and Steven Collins. Patrick Olivelle looked at how the early Vedic to Renouncer periods in Hinduism are marked by a shift from positive to negative evaluations of food. He demonstrated how this shift is manifested in narratives which inform renouncer practices. Some narratives assume that there was no food prior to the division into eater and eaten that marks the origin of the universe in Vedic texts. They therefore advocated forms of renunciation that seek to avoid the consumption of food entirely. This led to a variety of ascetic practices within Hinduism seeking to restrict the amount, type, frequency and degree of preparedness of food. The extent to which food was avoided was seen as a marker of a renouncer's progress towards liberation from *saṃsāra*. We later see elements of these early Hindu renouncer attitudes in the precept for Buddhist monastics limiting eating to before noon, the promotion by the Buddha of the practice of just eating once a day and the various permitted ascetic practices, which include several ways to restrict the quality, quantity or frequency of food.

In contrast, the Buddhist version of these cosmogonic narratives, the *Aggañña Sutta*, allows for the existence of food in the early golden period before mankind's corruption. However, it divides food into subtle and gross kinds. It associates living beings' craving for gross kinds of food with the corruption of food, that of the body,

and that of society. Further problems developed, it tells us, as people's greed led them to start harvesting, storing and processing food, a process that leads to violence and necessitates kingship for the restoration of order. A group of renunciators can avoid this by living outside society, only eating as and when they need to. The narrative thus advocates the early Buddhist moderate renunciation: monastics should eat, but only on a day-to-day basis. They should not store or prepare food. They should not crave it. These values become more clearly apparent in the later chapters on regulations for monks and nuns (Chapters Three and Four).

Several scholars have explored the *Aggañña Sutta* for the way it critiques brahminism and society, as well as the way it sets a model for renouncer behaviour (Gombrich, Olivelle and Collins). I have taken their work further by focusing on the understanding of the differences between subtle and gross food, and the relationship between the corruption of food and the development of sexual organs and lust. To do this I looked at Buddhist cosmology and physiology, noting that it is only in the *kāma* realm, the realm of sense desire, that beings eat gross food, and that higher level beings eat subtle food. After a detailed exploration of how physicality and the experience of food were believed to vary according to the different planes of existence, I then examined commentarial-period texts preserved in Chinese which relate the eating of gross food with the necessity for the body to have organs to excrete the waste products of food. The understanding of food and waste products is also applied to the presumed physiology of embryos in the womb, who are seen as living off subtle food until they are born. For the compilers of such texts, this meant that foetuses had no need to excrete waste products. The organs to excrete waste products, the urethra and anus, are seen as being closely linked with and enabling sexual activity. This provides the connection between gross food and lust found in the *Aggañña Sutta*. While using a later text to see this connection requires a reading back

that might prove anachronistic, it makes perfect sense in terms of logic of the text and thus provides the first clear explanation of all the steps in the degeneration of the universe and society outlined in the *Aggañña Sutta*.

Pursuing the way in which the *Aggañña Sutta* forms a model for Buddhist monastic behaviour, I built on earlier work by Steven Collins, which noted the close relationship between the model behaviour and corrupt behaviour described in that text and the ideals and prohibitions found in *vinaya* regulations. I identified further close parallels. In Chapter Two I then looked in more detail at the Buddha's initial rejection of ascetic food restrictions, the justifications for not eating after noon and the reasons for permitting certain ascetic food restrictions. I described the permitted ascetic practices and narratives promoting the one-meal-a-day rule in some detail. Both of these issues – ascetic practices and restricting food to one meal a day – may seem to be manifestations within Buddhism of the values of non-Buddhist renouncers who sought to exclude food as far as possible from their lives. However in Buddhist texts, which had presumably either forgotten or rejected that understanding of the universe, these practices are justified in other ways. Such reasons include the waste of time spent seeking out further meals and the dangers of association with lay society at times of sociability or during the hours of darkness.

The health benefits of such moderate eating are also mentioned in *sutta* texts advocating one meal a day and such narratives about the health benefits of moderation in food are taken further in later texts within Chinese Buddhism. Such texts also make a connection between physical health and a calm state of mind. , According to those narratives, those who resist such restrictions do so out of craving. I brought together an array of narratives which warn of the dangers of craving for food, including *jātaka* narratives which tell of monks in both this life and previous lives destroying their spiritual progress through their gluttony. Attachment to the

taste of food was also understood as a significant reason for monks abandoning their monkhood and returning to lay life. The association between gluttony and lust noted in the *Aggañña Sutta* is taken further in later treatises preserved in Chinese, where it is also associated with the vice of anger.

In Chapter Three I identified the rules in the *vinaya* that relate to food. Not eating after noon is one of the ten precepts for novices, monks and nuns, and rules concerning food make up over 20% of the total number of rules in the *pātimokkha sutta*, the main collection of rules governing the behaviour of monks and nuns as individuals. Nonetheless, these food rules, which govern the receipt, procuring and eating of food, fall into the less serious *pātimokkha* rules for monks, namely the *pācittiya*, *pāṭidesanīya* and *sekhiya* rules. For nuns, two food rules are more serious, found in the *saṅghādisesa* section, which requires a formal meeting of the Sangha.

Throughout Chapter Three I explored the *pātimokkha* food rules for monks, taking the Pali *vinaya* as my primary focus but then conducting a detailed comparison of how it compares with the other main extant Buddhist *vinayas*. As well as explaining each rule, and identifying the varying categories of food stuffs each rule relates to, I noted both variations within each of these rules about food and in the narrative ‘foundation myths’ for them. It may be that these narratives postdate the Buddha by some centuries. In some cases the narratives given by different *vinaya* schools are similar; in others they are quite different or at least give a different emphasis. Nonetheless they tell us of the varying concerns of the compilers of these codes of conduct as well as the broader religious and social contexts in which they were compiled. Again we see accounts of monks attempting to maintain ascetic practices more familiar to us from other renouncer traditions. Various reasons are given to reinforce their rejection, particularly lay people’s disgust and their resentment at monks’ interference in other religious rites, for example, their eating the offerings

left for deceased relatives. Other problems include the suspicion that monks were eating human flesh, regarded as both abhorrent and possible to confuse with practitioners of a different religious tradition, namely the charnal-ground ascetics later documented in Śaivism. The expectations of lay people about how monks should behave include that they should not be a burden, should act with decorum, should behave as if they had no attachment, should avoid monopolising food sources, and should avoid socialising and conversation about mundane or everyday topics. Another theme is that monks should not disappoint those who wish to give to them, for example they are not allowed to avoid food of poor quality or to eat elsewhere prior to attending a poor person's house by invitation. The temptation to store food is identified, and the hygiene risks as well as the reputational damage of doing so are emphasised.

The food rules in the *sekhiya* section, the most minor degree of rule in the *pātimokkha*, are all concerned with eating with decorum in front of lay supporters. They reveal that during the formation of the canon various forms of providing monks with food had emerged. As well as the alms round, we see food being given by invitation and at food distribution centres. The *sekhiya* rules are mainly concerned with decorum in non-alms round situations and cover the minutiae of handling food when eating it in front of an audience.

Some narratives for the establishment of food rules, notably those involving the entertaining 'Group of Six' monks, mark out licentious behaviour as going directly against the ideals of monkhood. The narratives about the prohibition of alcohol reflect the problems of loss of power and mindfulness, as well as that of habit formation. However, the *vinaya* rules do not, on the whole, address craving for food as a topic, even though the rules themselves may have the effect of controlling impulses that arise in response to craving. Rather, narratives concerning craving are found in

the *jātaka*. The *vinaya* rules are more concerned with the relationship with lay supporters.

In Chapter Four, I examined the additional rules for nuns in the *pātimokkha*. This led us into a range of discussions about attitudes to women, and the categorisation of certain foods as impure. Here we can see notions of impurity found in Hindu *Dharmasūtras* creeping into Buddhist *vinayas*. Early Buddhism rejected those brahminical notions of purity based on physical contamination, replacing them with notions of purity based on ethical conduct. However the brahminical prohibitions on garlic and other pungent vegetables eventually found their way into Buddhist *vinayas*. For example, garlic, although prohibited for nuns in a *pātimokkha* rule, is also prohibited for monks in some *vinayas* as one of the lesser rules, a *dukkata* offense, more minor than a *pātimokkha* rule. Monks who need to eat garlic because of illness then have to undergo remedies or countermeasures. A set of pungent vegetables also becomes prohibited in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda*.

The ‘Countermeasure for Garlic’ is not found in the Pali and the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya*, but is found in the Mahāsāṃghika, the Mahīśāsaka, the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*. This may suggest either a potential north Indian basis for this prohibition or that these *vinayas* were formulated later, when brahminical purity rules were in the ascendance. On the other hand, we again see concern for others driving the Buddhist rules. Their countermeasures for garlic are about the avoidance of contaminating the space of others with smell. It is not that the individual is regarded as impure – there is no loss of caste nor any need to eat purificatory substances for him/her, as there would be for a high caste Hindu. The adoption by Buddhism of purity rules that seem more at place in brahminical literature becomes more pronounced in Mahāyāna *sūtras* where a concern for lay people is less apparent, and the association of these vegetables with mental

defilement becomes more pronounced. Thus initially we see the adoption of essentially Hindu food exclusions, but with Buddhist justification, and later we see the Hindu notions of purity behind such food exclusions also being adopted but being interpreted in terms of mental defilements that hinder spiritual progress (rather than cause loss of caste).

A number of scholars such as Hirakawa Akira and Lambert Schmithausen have looked at the rules prohibiting monks from eating garlic, as well as prohibitions against them requesting raw grain. They examined whether such rules reflect concerns with plants as living organisms – which would be contrary to Buddhist cosmology – and thus indicate the adoption of rules by Buddhism which fit better into those renouncer traditions such as Jainism which do include plants as living organisms. Some scholars have also wondered about the widely found association of garlic with heightened sexual passion. I suggested that looking at the foundation stories in the Pali and other *vinayas* gives us a different answer. The background stories all relate to cooking, and subsequent to a detailed examination of these I concluded that these additional prohibitions for nuns exist to ensure that women who become nuns do not bring into their lives as renunciators certain practices traditionally associated with lay women, namely cooking. This brings us back to the *Aggañña Sutta*, which indicates that food storage and preparation are in themselves corrupting and to be avoided by renunciators. The *bhikkhunī vinayas* seem to identify women as being particularly at risk of continuing such non-renouncer practices despite formally undertaking to live as renunciators. This relates to the traditional role of women in Indian culture as preparers of food. Other additional rules for nuns relate to modesty in their origination narratives: requests for luxury food items are prohibited because lay people would then say that nuns are no different from prostitutes, seeking to make their complexions attractive. Nonetheless we can see here a point frequently

made when examining the differences between the male and female *vinaya* codes: rules for nuns may be found as applying to monks also, but there they are considered less significant, and needing less emphasis. While my view is that the rules for nuns relate to ensuring nuns behave as renunciators, such reasoning would have been lost in forms of Buddhism where it became the norm for monastics to be involved in food preparation, namely in East Asia within a cultural context where begging had different, namely negative, social values to the positive social value placed on relying on alms for food in Indian culture.

It is not clear whether these differences between monks and nuns in terms of the severity of food prohibition relate to discrimination against nuns or reflect the later formation of the nuns' codes such that once the rules were adopted by monks they had to be added to the end of the *vinayas*, i.e. to the rules outside of the *pātimokkha* list. However, it is worth noting that there are variations from one *vinaya* to another, with monks being allowed to request a greater number of luxury food items in the Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka *vinayas*. These two *vinayas* respectively prohibit only four and six items for monks, whereas for nuns they prohibit eight items; in all the other *vinaya*, eight or nine items are prohibited for both monks and nuns (albeit with differing severity of penalty).

Although early Buddhism avoided prohibitions of particular food items, in Chapter Four we saw exceptions to this in relation to garlic and pungent vegetables and the requesting of sumptuous food items. Further exceptions were discussed in Chapter Five, which brought us to the discussion of meat. To examine this subject we turned not to the *pātimokkha* rules of the *Suttavibhaṅga* but to the *Bhesajjakkhanda*, the medicine chapter, of the *Mahāvagga*. Here we examined how the purity of meat for consumption is dependent on the non-involvement of monks in its slaughter, whether by participating, witnessing or requesting. In addition to the prohibition on

human flesh, we also noted a further nine meats, resulting in a list of ten prohibited meats. The reasons for the prohibitions varied, from not taking valuable war animals (elephants and horses), to notions of sanctity (snakes) and impurity (dogs), and to fears of retribution (lions, and other beasts of prey).

While here meat is purified by the monk not being aware of its being prepared for him, some *sutta* texts provide other types of ‘purity’ in relation to food, which bring us back to the lack of craving or attachment previously seen in the *Aggañña Sutta*. The ethical approach found in such texts is one akin to what in Western ethics discourse is termed virtue ethics, in contrast to consequentialist ethics: it is fine for a lay person to seek meat for the monk, as long as the monk is not the person instigating or witnessing it. Therefore the emphasis is on the monk’s purity, not the avoidance of an animal’s death.

The prohibited meats listed in the *Bhesajjakkhandha* sit within the context of ample evidence in all *vinayas* for the Buddha and his monks eating meat. Such texts have quite a different attitude from those later texts which witness the emergence of vegetarianism in Buddhism. Vegetarianism turns up in the Five Points of Devadatta, which advocate a more ascetic life for all monks and nuns. Devadatta wanted to make the optional restrictions compulsory for all monks and nuns. His views were rejected, but the issue returned in early Mahāyāna *sūtras*, some of which advocate vegetarianism. Initially vegetarianism in these texts appears to be adopted in response to renouncer competition – lay people had come to expect renunciators to eschew meat, or at least preferred those who demonstrated their greater ascetic quality by doing so. Another reason given for the adoption of vegetarianism is the difficulty of distinguishing between prohibited and permitted meats. While many Mahāyāna *sūtras* advocate vegetarianism on the basis of compassion, notions of

physical impurity and of meat generating spiritual defilements such as lust also come into the justification for vegetarianism in texts such as the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

A marked division is found between those Mahāyāna sūtras that include milk as an animal product to be avoided and those that see milk as a purifying substance to be included in the monastic diet. After looking at the differences between Indian and Chinese attitudes to dairy products, I concluded that these differences reflect whether the versions of the texts as we now have them originated within an Indian or Chinese context.

If most of these texts are concerned with lay expectations of monks, what then of the initial emphasis on the avoidance of craving in relation to food? While the restrictive practices might help by controlling the impulse to react to cravings for food, for example by prohibiting the seeking out of certain types of food or continuing to eat throughout the day, how are monks and nuns to address their cognitive responses to food? In the final chapter I examined two different transmissions of the meditation on the repulsiveness of food. What I found was that while the Theravada transmission represented by the *Visuddhimagga* emphasised the unpleasantness of the alms round and the impurity of food once the digestive processes have started, the Sarvāstivāda tradition ignored the alms round. Instead it imposed notions of impurity on food that, within the Pali tradition, is considered pure, namely food fit for consumption prior to ingestion and digestion. The Sarvāstivāda did this by drawing on *asubhabhāvanā* practices and equating food with impure substances. I turned to the modern psychology of food to see if it offered us any insights into the validity of what might on the face of it seem like a somewhat artificial process. Modern food psychology is a growing field because of the epidemic rise in obesity in developed nations. What it demonstrates is that food aversions such as those that might arise using the *asubhabhāvanā* practices can indeed be learned and effective.

What we find in Buddhist texts then is a complex array of narratives, rules and meditation instructions to manage both the relationship between monastics and food and that between monastics and the providers of food. While the narratives in *sutta* and *jātaka* texts and the instructions in meditation address the craving for food which is regarded as trapping one in *saṃsāra* and causing problems for society, the *vinaya* texts and early Mahāyāna *sūtras* are primarily concerned with responding to lay expectations of renunciators. As such expectations changed, so did the *vinayas*, accommodating developing notions of renouncer behaviour and even accommodating notions of physical purity.

It is tempting to draw conclusions about the relative dating of the *vinayas* on the basis of the accommodation of the different attitudes to food that rose to dominance in India during the centuries when the different *vinayas* were being compiled. However, the differences might also be put down to geography. The Theravada and Dharmaguptaka *vinayas* appear to be less influenced by the rules that could be related to caste-based notions of purity, such as garlic, which they do not prohibit. We know that both these *vinayas* were present in Sri Lanka. By contrast, the shorter list of luxury food items in the Dharmaguptaka gives the impression it might be earlier, whereas the Theravada has the longest list. Does this mean the Theravada is later or stricter, given that the food items in themselves are not geographically or chronologically specific? From their mentioning of *caṇḍāla*, i.e. untouchables according to the brahminical law books such as *Manusmṛti* (which reached its current version c.100CE), the *Mahīśāsaka* and *Mahāsāṃghika* *vinayas* appear to accept caste based food restrictions in their reasoning for the rejection of eating elephant and horse flesh, although the other *vinayas* also reject this food. They are among the four *vinaya* that reject the consumption of garlic. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda* is aware of, but more dismissive of, arguments based on caste, yet it has the strictest garlic rules, as

well as the prohibition against pungent vegetables. This evidence suggests perhaps that at least this part of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* is the latest to develop or that while contesting caste it nonetheless accepted caste-based food restriction because of the competitive aspects of renunciation and purity. Through comparing the differences in the number of luxury foodstuffs between the nun's eight *pāṭidesanīya* rules and the number of luxury foodstuffs for monks, we might conclude that the nun's *pāṭidesanīya* rules were established later than those of monk's rules and that the nun's *pāṭidesanīya* rules have not changed throughout time and place. However, again we have to be wary about the ways in which attitudes to women led to stricter *vinayas* for them. Overall, then, the food rules may be seen as indicative of the religious context and thus the dating and geography of the *vinayas*. However, a closer examination of these aspects in relation to other criteria for judging the relative dating of these texts is needed before we can reach any firm statements on this matter.

Abbreviations

ADh: *Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra*

AN: *Aṅguttara Nikāya*

ĀśGS: *Āśvalāyana Gr̥hya Sūtra*

Āyārs: *Āyāraṅga (Ācārāṅga) Sūtra*

BAU: *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*

BDh: *Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra*

CRN: Contemplation of the Repulsiveness of Nutrition

CU: *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*

DN: *Dīgha Nikāya*

GDh: *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*

J: *Jātaka*

Ji: Jiaxing Tripiṭaka (Chinese Tripiṭaka edited in China)

Mil. P.: *Milindapañha*

MN: *Majjhima Nikāya*

MS: *Manu Smṛti*

PED: The Pali Text Society's *Pali-English Dictionary*

ŚB: *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*

Sn: *Sutta Nipāta*

T: *Taisho Shinshu Daizhokyo* (Chinese *Tripiṭaka* edited in Japan)

TĀ: *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*

TB: *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*

Thag: *Theragāthā*

VDh: *Vāsiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra*

Vin: *Vinaya*

Vism: *Visuddhimagga*

X: *Manji zokuzokyo* (Chinese *Tripitaka* edited in Japan)

YDh: *Yajñavalkyasmṛti*

Bibliography

1. Pali sources

Aṅguttara nikāya. (1961-1979). (eds.) R. Morris, Vols. I-III, and E. Hardy, Vols. IV-V.

London: The Pali Text Society.

Dīgha nikāya. (1889-2006). (eds.) T. W. Rhys Davids and J.E. Carpenter, Vols. I-II, and J.E.

Carpenter, Vol. III. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Dhammapada commentary. (1906-1993). (eds.) Helmer Smith, Vols. I-I.I; H.C. Norman,

Vols. II-IV; L.S. Tailang, Vol. V. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Jatāka. (1877-1992). (eds.) V. Fausbøll, Vols. I-VI; Dines Andersen, Vol. VII. London: The

Pāli Text Society.

Khuddakapāṭha. (1915 and 1978) (ed.) Helmer, Smith. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Majjhima nikāya. (1888-2006). (eds.) V. Trenckner, Vol. I; R. Chalmers, Vols. II-III; M.

Yamazaki and Y. Ousaka, Vol. IV. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Samyutta nikāya. (1884-2006). (eds.) L. Feer, Vols. I-V; Mrs C.A.F Rhys Davids, Vol. VI.

London: The Pāli Text Society.

Sutta nipāta. (1913 and 1990). (eds.) Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith. London: The

Pāli Text Society

Theragāthā & Therīgāthā. (1883-1990). (eds.) H. Oldenbeg and R. Pischel, K.R.Norman

and L. Alsdorf. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Udāna. (1885 and 1982). (eds.) P. Steinthal. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Vinaya. (1879-1993). (eds.) H. Oldenberg, Vols. I-V. London: The Pāli Text Society.

Visuddhimagga. (1920 and 1921). (eds.) Mrs C.A.F Rhys Davids, Vols. I-II; (1975).

Reprinted as one. London: The Pāli Text Society.

2. Chinese sources

1) *Taisho Shinshu Daizhokyo* 大正新修大藏經. (eds.) J. Takakush and K, Watanabe.

Tokyo. 1924-1935.

Vol. 1

No. 1: 佛說長阿含經 *Foshuo chang ahan jing* (*Dirgha Āgama*), (tr.) 佛陀耶舍 Fo tuo ye she (Buddhayaśa) and 竺佛念 Zhu fo nian.

No. 24: 起世經 *Qishi jing*, (tr.) 闍那崛多 Du na jue duo (Jñānagupta).

No. 26: 中阿含經 *Zhong a han jing* (*Madhyama Āgama*) (tr.) 僧伽提婆 Seng ga ti po (Saṅghadeva).

Vol. 2

No. 99: 雜阿含經 *Za ahan jing* (*Samyutta āgama*), (tr.) 求那跋陀羅 Qiu na ba tuo luo (Guṇabhadra).

No. 120: 央掘魔羅經 *Yang jue mo luo jing* (*Aṅgulimāliya Sūtra*) (tr.) 求那跋陀羅 Qiu na ba tuo luo (Guṇabhadra).

No. 125: 增壹阿含經 *Zeng yi a han jing* (*Ekottara Āgama*)(tr.) 僧伽提婆 Seng ga ti po (Saṅghadeva).

Vol. 3

No. 152: 六度集經 *Liu du ji jing* (tr.) 康僧會 Kang seng hui.

Vol. 8

No. 223: 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 *Mohe ban ruo boluo mi jing* (*Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra*) (tr.) 鳩摩羅什 Jiu mo luo shi (Kumārajīva).

No. 227: 小品般若波羅蜜經 *Xiaopin banruo boluomi jing* (*Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*) (tr.) 鳩摩羅什 Jiu mo luo shi (Kumārajīva).

Vol. 12

No. 374: 大般涅槃經 *Daban niepan jing* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*) (tr.) 曇無讖 Tan wu chen (Dharmakṣema)

No. 376: 佛說大般泥洹經 *Foshuo daban nihuan jung* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*) (tr.) 法顯 Faxian

No. 387: 大方等無想經 *Da fangdeng wu xiang jing* (tr.) 曇無讖 Tan wu chen.

Vol. 14

No. 468: 文殊師利問經 *Wenshu shi li wen jing* (*Mañjuśrīpariṣccha Sūtra*) (tr.) 僧伽婆羅 Seng ga po luo (Saṅghavarman).

Vol. 16

No. 670: 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 *Lengg abaduoluo bao jing* (*Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*) (tr.) 求那跋陀羅 Qiu na ba tuo luo (Guṇabhadra).

No. 671: 入楞伽經 *Rulengga jing* (*Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*) (tr.) 菩提留支 Puti liu zhi (Bodhiruci).

No. 672: 大乘入楞伽經 *Dacheng rulengga jing* (*Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*) (tr.) 實叉難陀 Shi cha nan tuo (Śikṣānanda).

Vol. 17

No. 783: 佛說十二頭陀經 *Fo shuo shier toutuo jing* (tr.) 求那跋陀羅 Qiu na ba tuo luo (Guṇabhadra).

No. 814: 佛說象腋經 *Fo shuo xiang ye jing* (tr.) 曇摩蜜多 Tan mo mi duo (Dharma mitra).

Vol. 19

No. 945: 首楞嚴經 *Shou leng yan jing* (*Śūraṅgama Sūtra*) (tr.) 般刺蜜帝 Ban la mi di (Pramiti).

Vol. 22

No. 1421: 五分律 *Wufen lu* (*Mahīśāsaka vinaya*) (tr.) 佛陀什 Fo tuo shi (Buddhajīva) and 竺道生 Zhu dao sheng.

No. 1425: 摩訶僧祇律 *Mohesengqu lu* (*Mahāsāṃghika vinaya*) (tr.) 佛陀跋陀 Fo tuo ba tuo (Buddhabhadra) and 法顯 Faxian.

No. 1428: 四分律 *Sifen lu* (*Dharmaguptaka vinaya*) (tr.) 佛陀耶舍 Fo tuo ye she (Buddhayaśa) and 竺佛念 Zhufonian.

Vol. 23

No. 1435: 十誦律 *Shisong lu* (*Sarvāstivādin vinaya*) (tr.) 弗若多羅 Fo ruo duo luo (Puṇyātara).

No. 1442: 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* (*Mūlasarvāstivādin vinaya*) (tr.) 義淨 Yijing.

Vol. 24

No. 1458: 根本薩婆多部律攝 *Genben sapoduobu lushe* (tr.) 義淨 Yi jing.

No. 1463: 毘尼母經 *Pinimu jing*, Unknown author.

No. 1484: 梵網經 *Fan wang jing* (*Brahmajāla Sūtra*) (tr.) 鳩摩羅什 Jiu mo luo shi (Kumārajīva).

Vol. 25

No. 1509: 大智度論 *Dazhidu lun* (*Mahāprajñā pāramitā śāstra*), 龍樹 Long shu (Nāgārjuna) (tr.) 鳩摩羅什 Jiu mo luo shi (Kumārajīva).

Vol. 26

No. 1536: 阿毘達磨集異門足論 *Apidamo jiyimenzu lun* (*Abhidharma Saṅgitiparyaya*), Śāriputra. (tr.) 玄奘 Xuan-zang.

Vol. 27

No. 1545: 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 *Apidamo da piposha lun* (*Mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra*), Five Hundreds of Mahārahants. (tr.) 玄奘 Xuan-zang.

Vol. 29

No. 1558: 阿毘達磨俱舍論 *Apidamo jush lun* (*Abhidharma kośa-bhāṣya*), Vasubandhu. (tr.) 玄奘 Xuan-zang.

No. 1562: 阿毘達磨順正理論 *Apidamo shunzhengli lun* (*Abhidharmanyāyānusāra śāstra*),
Saṅghabhadra. (tr.) 玄奘 Xuan-zang.

Vol. 30

No. 1579: 瑜伽師地論 *Yuqieshidi lun* (*Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*), Maitreya. (tr.) 玄奘 Xuan-zang.

Vol. 32

No. 1646: 成實論 *Chengshi lun* (*Satyasiddhi śāstra*), (tr.) 鳩摩羅什 Jiu mo Luo Shi
(Kumārajīva).

No. 1648: 解脫道論 *Jietuo dao lun* (*Vimuttimagga*), Upatissa (tr.) 僧伽婆羅 Seng gap o
luo (Saṅghapala).

Vol. 40

No. 1804: 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 *Sifen lu shanfanbuquexingshichao*, 道宣 Dao xuan.

No. 1815: 梵網經古適記 *Fanwan jing guji ji*, 太賢 Tae Hyun.

Vol. 46

No. 1911: 摩訶止觀 *Mohe zhiguan* (tr.) 智顗 Zhiyi.

No. 1916: 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門 *Shi chan boluomi cidi famen*, 智顗 Zhiyi.

Vol. 50

No. 2043: 阿育王經 *Ayouwang jing*, (tr.) 僧伽婆羅 Saṅghavarman

Vol. 51

No. 2085: 高僧法顯傳 *Gaoseng faxian chuan*, 法顯 Fa xian.

No. 2087: 大唐西域記 *Datang xiyuji*, 玄奘 Xuan-zang.

Vol. 53

No. 2121: 經律異相 *Jing lu yi xiang*, 旻寶唱 Min bao chang.

Vol. 55

No. 2154: 開元釋教錄 *Kaiyuan shi jiao lu*, 智昇 Zhi sheng.

2) *Manji zokuzokyo* 卍字續藏經 (ed.) Kyoto 1905-12.

Vol. 11

No. 269: 首楞嚴經集解熏聞記 *Shou leng yan jing ji jie xun wen ji*, 仁岳 Ren yue.

No. 270: 楞嚴經要解 *Lengyanjing yaojie*, 戒環 Jie huan.

No. 271: 楞嚴經箋 *Lengyanjing jian*, 可度 Ke du.

Vol. 15

No. 303: 楞嚴經貫攝 *Leng yan jing quan she*, 劉道開 Liu dao kai.

Vol. 16

No. 308: 楞嚴經指掌疏 *Lengyanjing zhizhangshu*, 通理 Tong li.

Vol.39

No. 1799: 首楞嚴義疏注經 *Shoulengyan yishuzhu jing* (tr.) 子璿 Zi xuan.

3) *Jiaxing dazing jing* 嘉興大藏經, (ed) Ming, 1589-1677.

Vol. 35

No. B326: 木人剩稿 *Murenshenggao*, 開滂 kai wei.

3. English and Japanese sources

Abe, J. (2001). *A Study of Dhūtaṅga: Based on Pāli Buddhism*. Tokyo: ShunJusha.

Alsdorf, Ludwig. (2010). *The History of Vegetarianism and Cow-Veneration in India*. London and New York: Routledge.

Banerji, S. C. (1971). *A Companion to Sanskrit Literature: a period of over three thousand years*. Delhi. Motilal Banarsidass.

Bapat, P. V. (1937). 'Dhutaṅgas (or the Ascetic Practices of Purification in Buddhism)'. *Indian Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 13, pp. 44-51.

Basham, A. L. (1951). *History and Doctrines of the Ajivikas: a vanished Indian religion*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Basham, A. L. (1954). *The Wonder That Was India: a survey of the history and culture of the Indian sub-continent before the coming of the Muslims*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson.
- Benn, James. A. (2005). 'Buddhism, Alcohol, and Tea in Medieval China.' In R Sterckx, (Ed.) (1984). *Of Tripod and Palate: Food, Politics, and Religion in Traditional China*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bodiford, William M. (2005). (ed.) *Going forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Bollée, W. B. (1993). 'Le Végétarisme defend par Haribhadrāsūri contre un bouddhiste et un brahmane', in N. K. Wagle and F. Watanabe (ed.) *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A. K. Warder*. University of Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies: pp.22-28.
- Bronkhorst, J. (1993). *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bronkhorst, J. (1995). 'The Buddha and the Jains Reconsidered'. *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatiques*. Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 333-350.
- Bronkhorst, J. (1998). *The Two Sources of Indian Asceticism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Burghart, Richard. (1978). 'Hierarchical Models of the Hindu Social System'. *Man*. Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 519-536.
- Bynum, C. Walker. (1987). *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the religious significance of food to medieval women*. California: University of California Press.
- Carrithers, M. (1989). 'Naked Ascetics in Southern Digambar Jainism.' *Man*. Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 219-235.
- Chakraborti, H. (1973). *Asceticism in Ancient India in Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jaina, and Ajivika Societies from the Earliest Times to the Period of Sankaracharya*. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak.

- Chalmers, R.; Francis, H. T; Cowell, E. B and Rouse, W.H.D (tr.) (1895-2013). *The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*. London: The Pāli Text Society. (Vol. I-VI and Index volume).
- Chandra, Pratap. (1971). 'Was Early Buddhism Influenced by the Upanisads?'. *Philosophy East and West*. Vol. 21, pp. 317-324.
- Chapple, G. K. (1993). *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*. Delhi: Indian Book Centre.
- Collins, S. (1993). 'The Discourse on What is Primary (Aggañña-Sutta).' *Journal of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 301-393.
- Crosby, K. (2014). *Theravada Buddhism: Continuity, Diversity, and Identity*. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Dakeuchi, Yoshihide. (1994). 'The Notion of the Impurity of Food (*āhāre paṭikkulasaññā*) in Early and Abhidharma Buddhism.' *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 917-922.
- Douglas, M. (1995). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge.
- Dundas, Paul. (1985). 'Food and Freedom: The Jaina sectarian debate on the nature of the kevalin'. *Religion*. Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 161-98.
- Dundas, Paul. (1992). *The Jains*. London: Routledge.
- Dundas, Paul. 'The Meat at the Wedding Feast: Kṛṣṇa, Vegetarianism and a Jain Dispute in Joseph T. O'Connell (ed.), *Jain Doctrine and Practice: Academic Perspectives*, University of Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies: pp.85-112.
- Dutt, M. N (1896). *Kamandakiya Nītisara*. Calcutta: Elysium press.
- Dutt, M. N. (tr.) (2005). *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti*. Delhi: Parimal Publications.
- Dutt, S. (1962). *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

- Ehara, Rev. N.R.M, Soma Thera and Kheminda Thera (tr.) (1961). *The Path of Freedom*.
Colombo: M.D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd.
- Findly, E. B. (2002). 'Borderline Beings: Plant Possibilities in Early Buddhism'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol. 122. No. 2, pp. 252-263.
- Fusimoto, A. (2002). 'Do Plants Have Lives?: Two Kinds of *Jīvitindriya* by the Theravādins'. *Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Association*. Vol. 68, pp. 87-109.
- Garrett, F. (2008). *Religion, Medicine and the Human Embryo in Tibet*. London: Routledge.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gellner, E. (1988). *Plough, Sword and Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gokhale, B. G. (1970). 'The Brahmanas in early Buddhist literature'. *Journal of Indian History*. Vol. 48, pp. 51-61.
- Gombrich, R. F. (1992a). 'The Buddha's Book of Genesis?', *Indo-Iranian Journal*. Vol. 35, pp. 179-191.
- Gombrich, R. F. (1992b). 'Why is a *khattiya* called a *khattiya*? The *Aggañña Sutta* revisited.' *Journal of the Pali Text Society*. Vol. 17, pp. 213-4.
- Gorman, Michael J. (2010). *The Elements of Biblical Exegesis: A Basic Guide for Students and Ministers, Revised and Expanded Edition*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Grey, L. (1994). *A concordance of Buddhist birth stories*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Griffiths, P. (1981). 'Concentration or insight: the problematic of Theravada Buddhist meditation-theory'. *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. Vol. 49, pp. 605-624.
- Griffiths, P. (1983). 'Buddhist *jhāna*: a Form-Critical Study'. *Religion*. Vol. 13, pp. 55-68.
- Gunawardana, R. A. L. H. (1984-1985). 'Obstetrics and Theories of Reproduction in Ancient and Early Medieval Sri Lanka.' *KALYĀṆĪ: Journal of Humanities and Social Science of the University of Kelaniya*. Vols. III and IV, pp. 1-21.

- Gupta, L. P. 1999. *Biogenic Secrets of Food in Ayurveda*. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.
- Gupta, L. P. (1999). *Biogenic secrets of food in Ayurveda*. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.
- Hamilton, C. H. (1950). 'The Idea of Compassion in Mahayana Buddhism.' *Journal of American Oriental Society*, vol. 70, No.3, pp. 145-150.
- Harnik, G. F. (1995). 'Religion and Food: An Anthropological Perspective'. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. Vol. 63, No. 3, pp. 565-82.
- Harrison, P. (1990). *The Samadhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Hayashima, Kyosho. (1964). *Early Buddhism and Social life*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, Publishers.
- Heesterman, J. C. (1988). 'Householder and wanderer'. In T.N. Madan (ed.), *Way of life: King, Householder, renouncer: essays in honour of Louis Dumont*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Heim, M. (2004). *Theories of the Gift in South Asia: Hindu, Buddhism, and Reflections on Dana*. London: Routledge.
- Heim, M. (2014). *The Forerunner of All Things: Buddhaghosa on Mind, Intention, and Agency*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heirman, A. and T. De Rauw. (2006). 'Offenders, sinners and criminals: The consumption of forbidden food.' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.* Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 57-83.
- Hetherington, M. M. and B. J. Rolls. (1996). 'Sensory-specific satiety: Theoretical frameworks and central characteristics'. In Capaldi, Elizabeth. D. (ed.), *Why We Eat What We Eat: The psychology of eating*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

- Hill, S. E. (2011). *Eating to Excess: The Meaning of Gluttony and the Fat Body in the Ancient World*. California: Praeger.
- Hirakawa, Akira. 1964. *Studies in Early Buddhism*. Tokyo: Shunjusha.
- Hirakawa, A. (1993). *A History of Indian Buddhism*. P. Groner (tr.). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Hirakawa, A. (1994). *A Study of 250 precepts* (二百五十戒の研究). Tokyo: Shunjusha.
- Hirakawa, A. (1998). *A Study of Bhikkhuni Vinaya* (比丘尼律の研究). Tokyo: Shunjusha.
- Horner, I. B. (tr.) (1938-2014). *The Book of the Discipline*. Oxford. The Pali Text Society.
- Hujimoto, A. (2002). 'Do Plants Have Lives?: Two Kinds of Jīvitindriya by the Theravādins'. *Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Association*. Vol. 68, pp. 87-109.
- Hume, R. E. (tr.) (1985). *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Huxley, Andrew. (1996). 'The Vinaya: Legal System or Performance-Enhancing Drug?' In T. Skorupski (ed.), *The Buddhist Forum* Vol. IV, London: SOAS. pp. 141-163.
- Ikegami, Y. (2002). 'Variety of the Nature in the Early Buddhism'. *Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Association*. Vol. 68, pp. 13-33.
- Iwaki, Eiki. (2004). 'Tiantai Commentaries on the Śuraṅgamasamādhi-Sūtra in Song Times and Later.' *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 52. No.2, pp. 638-642.
- Iwamoto, Yutaka. (1978). *The Origin and Development of Buddhist Narrative*. Tokyo: Kaimeishi.
- Jacobi, Hermann. (tr.) (1884, repr. 1968). *Jaina Sutras* (SBE Vol. 22). Delhi: Banarsidass.
- Jaini, P. S. (1979). *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jaini, P. S. (1993). 'Jaina Attitude toward Eating' In R. Smet and K. Watnabe (eds.), *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*. Pp. 339-354.
- Jamison, S. W and Brereton, J. P. (tr.) (2014). *The Rigveda: the earliest religious poetry of India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Jha, D. N. (2002). *The Myth of the Holy Cow*. London: Verso.
- Jones, J. J. (tr.) (1945). *The Mahavastu*. London: Luzac & Company, LTD.
- Kane, P. V. (1974). *History of Dharmasastra* Vol. II, Part II. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. pp. 757-800.
- Kapadia, H. R. (1933). 'Prohibition of Flesh-Eating in Jainism'. *The Review of Philosophy and Religion*. Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 232-239.
- Khare, R. S. (1992). *The Eternal Food: Gastronomic Ideas and Experiences of Hindus and Buddhists*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kieschnick, J. (2005). 'Buddhist Vegetarianism in China.' In: R. Sterckx. (ed.) *Of Tripod and Palate: Politics, and Religion in traditional China*. New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kloppenborg, Ria. (1990). 'The Buddha's redefinition of *tapas* (ascetic practice)'. *Buddhist Studies Review*. Vol. 7, pp. 49-73.
- Kondo, E. (1960). 'Meaning of alms-round in Zen'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 666-671.
- Korsmeyer, C. (1999). *Making Sense of Tasting*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Lanman, C. R and Whitney, W. D. (1993). *Atharva-veda-saṃhitā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Lorenzen, D. N. (1972). *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: two lost Saivite sects*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Macdermott, J. P. (1989). 'Animals and Humans in Early Buddhism'. *Indo-Iranian Journal*. Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 269-280.
- Maity, S. K. (1957). *Economic Life of Northern India in the Gupta Period (Cir. A. D. 300-550)*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Ltd.
- Maria, J. S. (1978). *Anna Yoga*. London: Rider.

- Malalasekera, G.P. (1928). *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Marriott, M. (1989). 'Constructing an Indian Ethnosociology'. *Contribution to Indian Sociology*. Vol. 23, pp. 1-39.
- Matsunami, Yoshihiro. (1979). 'Conflict within the Development of Buddhism.' *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 6 (1/2), 329-345.
- Mehta, R. (1937). 'Asceticism in Pre-Buddhist days'. *Indian Culture*. Vol. 3, pp. 571-584.
- Mishra, Y. K. (1987). *Asceticism in ancient India*. Vaishali: Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa.
- Mizuno, Kogen. (1954). 'The Relationship between the Mahayana literature and Nikaya Buddhisms.' In Miyamoto, Shooson. *A Historical Study of Establishment of Mahayana Buddhism*. Tokyo: Sansiedo Shuppan. pp. 273-313.
- Mizuno, K. 1997. 'Comparative study of the *Vimuttimaggā* and the *Visuddhimaggā*.' In *A Study of Buddhist literature* (the Collection of works by Mizuno Kogen, vol.1). Tokyo: Shunjusha.
- Mittananda Bhikkhu and Oskar von Hinuber. (2000). 'The Cause of the Buddha's Death.' *Journal of the Text Society*. Vol. 26, pp. 105-117.
- Nakamura, Hajime. (1974). *The Formation of Early Buddhism*. Tokyo: Shunjusha. pp 425-449.
- Nakamura, Hajime. (1989). *Iwanami Buddhist Dictionary*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Nakamura, Hajime. (1992). *The Establishment of Early Buddhism*. Tokyo. Shunjusha. (the Collection of Nakamura Hajime works, Vol. 14).
- Ñāṇamoli Bhikkhu. (1978). *The Life of the Buddha*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Ñāṇamoli Bhikkhu. (tr.) (1991). *The Path of Purification*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu and Bhikkhu Bodhi (tr.) (1995/2010). *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Majjhima Nikaya*. Massachusetts: Wisdom Publications.
- Newton, D. (1998). *Deity and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Norm, Phelps. (2004). *The Great Compassion*. New York: Lantern Books.
- O’Flaherty, W. Doniger (1976). *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Okano, K. (2002). ‘The Relationship among Human beings, animals and plants in Cosmological History in Sammatiya school in India.’ *Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Research Association*. Vol. 68, pp. 71-85.
- Okano, K. (2004). ‘The Name of a Mythical Food in the *Aggañña-Sutta*: lasa/ras/rasa.’. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 858-851.
- Oldenberg, H. (tr.) (1886). *The Griha Sutras* SBE 29. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, P. (1974 A). ‘The Notion of āśrama in the Dharmasūtras’. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sudasiens*. Vol. 18, pp. 27-35.
- Olivelle, P. (1974 B). *The Origin and the Early Development of Buddhist Monachism*. Colombo: Cunasena.
- Olivelle, P. (1981). ‘Contributions to the Semantic History of Samnyāsa’. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol. 101, pp. 265-274.
- Olivelle, P. (1984). ‘Renouncer and Renunciation in the Dharmaśāstras’. In: R. W. Lariviere. (ed.) *Studies in Dharmasastra*. Calcutta: Firma KLM. pp. 81-152.
- Olivelle, P. (1987). ‘From feast to past: food and the Indian ascetic’, In *Panels of The VIIth World Sanskrit Conference: Rules and Remedies in Classical Indian Law*. Vol. IX. Leiden: E.J. BRILL. pp. 17-36.

- Olivelle, Patrick. (1991). 'From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic.' In J. Leslie (Ed.), *Rules and Remedies in Classical Indian Law (Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference Vol. 9)*, pp. 17-36. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (tr.) (1992). *Samnyāsa Upaniṣads: Hindu scriptures on asceticism and renunciation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, P. (1993). *The Asrama System: The History and Hermeneutics of a Religious Institution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (1995a). 'Food in India: A Review Essay', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 23, pp. 367-380.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (tr.) (1995b). *Rules and Regulations of Brahmanical Asceticism. Yatidharmasamuccaya of Yadava Prakasa*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (1997). 'Amṛtā: Women and Indian Technologies of Immortality', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25 no. 5: 427-49.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (tr.) (1999). *The dharma Sūtras: the Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (2002). 'Abhaksya and abhojya: An exploration in Dietary Language'. *Journal of American Oriental Society*. Vol. 122, No. 2, pp. 345-54.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (tr.) (2004). *The Law Code of Manu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle. 2010. 'Dharmaśāstra: a textual history.' in: *Hinduism and Law: An Introduction*. (eds). Timothy Lubin, Donald R. Davis, Jr and Jayanth, K. Krishnan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. (2011). *Ascetics and Brahmins: Studies in Ideologies and Institutions*. Anthem Press. Accessed from <http://universitypublishingonline.org/anthem/aaa/chapter.jsf?bid=CBO9781843318026&cid=CBO9781843318026A009> on 15/5/2015.

- Prakash, Om. (1961). *Food and Drinks in Ancient India: (From earliest times to C. 1200 A.D)*.
Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Prebish, Charles. S. (1994). *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*. Taiwan: Jin Luen Publishing House
- Pruitt, William (ed.) and Norman, K. R (tr.) (2001) *The Patimokkha*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Reynolds, F. (1972). 'The Two Wheels of Dhamma', in B.L. Smith (ed.), *The Two Wheels of Dhamma*. Chambersburg: American Academy of Religion.
- Reynolds, F.E. and Reynolds, M.B. (1982). *Three Worlds According to King Ruang: A Thai Buddhist Cosmology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rhys Davids, C. A. F. and Rhys Davids, T. W. (1899-1995). *Dialogues of the Buddha*.
London: Pali Text Society. (3 Vols).
- Ruegg D. Seyfort. (1980). *Ahimsa and Vegetarianism in the History of Buddhism*. In S. Balasooriya et al. (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*. London: The Roundwood Press.
- Ryan, P.D. (1998). *Buddhism and the Natural World: Towards a Meaningful Myth*.
Birmingham: Windhorse Publication.
- Sahni, Pragati. (2011). *Environmental Ethics in Buddhism: A Virtues Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Sato, Mitsuyu. (1972). *A Study of the Early Buddhist Order in the Vinaya Pitaka*. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin.
- Sayers, M. R. (2008). 'Feeding the Ancestors: Ancestor Worship in Ancient Hinduism and Buddhism.' Ph.D Dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas.
- Schmidt, H. P. (1997). 'Ahimsa and rebirth.' *Witzel*. Pp. 207-234.
- Schmithausen, L. (1991a). *Buddhism and Nature*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

- Schmithausen, L. (1991b). *The problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Schmithausen, L. (2000). 'Buddhism and the Ethics of Nature: Some Remarks.' *The Eastern Buddhist*. Vol. 32, No.2, pp. 26-78.
- Schmithausen, L. (2000b). 'A Note on the origin of ahiṃsā.' In Ryutaro Tsuchida and Albrecht Wezler (Hrsg), *Haranandalahari. Volume in Honour of professor Minoru Hara on his seventieth Birthday*. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler, pp. 253-282.
- Schmithausen, L. (2009). *Plants in Early Buddhism and the Far Eastern Idea of the Buddha-Nature of Grasses and Trees*. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute.
- Schopen, Gregory. (1996). 'The Suppression of Nuns and the Ritual Murder of Their Special Dead in two Buddhist Monastic Texts'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 24, pp. 563-592.
- Schopen, Gregory. (2007). 'The Learned Monk as a Comic Figure on Reading a Buddhist Vinaya as Indian Literature'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 35, pp. 201-226.
- Schroeder J. H. (2001). *Skillful Means: the Heart of Buddhist Compassion*. Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schubring, W. 1935. *The Doctrine of the Jainas. Described after the Old Sources*. tr. Wolfgang, B. 2nd English Edition. 2000. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.
- Seyfort Ruegg, D. (1980). 'Ahimsa and Vegetarianism in the History of Buddhism'. In Somaratna et al. (eds.) *Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula*. London: Srilanka: Gordon Frazer. pp, 234-241.
- Sharma, K. N. (1961). 'Hindu Sects and Food Pattern in North India'. In L. P. Vidyarthi. (ed.) *Aspects of Religion in Indian Society*. Ranchi: Bihar Council of Social and Cultural Research. pp. 45-58.
- Shimizu, Y. (2007). 'The Point of View of Plants in Primitive Buddhism'. *The Journal of Buddhist Studies and Humanities*. Vol. 85, No. 4, pp. 19-35.

- Shimoda, Masahiro. (1989). 'Reconsideration of the Three Kinds of Pure Meat'. *Buddhist Culture*. Vol. 22, No. 25, pp. 1-21.
- Shimoda, Masahiro. (2000). *A Study of the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra: A Experimental Methodology of Mahāyāna sutras*. Tokyo: Shunzusha Publisher.
- Shirashi, Ryokai. (1996). *Asceticism in Buddhism and Brahmanism: A Comparative Study*. Tring (the UK). The Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Simoons F. J. (1974), 'The purificatory role of the five products of the cow in Hinduism'. *The Ecology of Food and Nutrition*. Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 21-34.
- Simoons F. J. (1980). *Food, Ecology and culture*. London: Cordon and Breach Science Publishers.
- Simoons, F. J. (1998). *Plants of Life, Plants of Death*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Singer, P. (1975). *Animal Liberation*. New York: Avon.
- Skilton, Andrew. (2002). 'An early Mahāyāna transformation of the story of Kṣāntivādin: 'The Teacher of Forbearance''. *Buddhist Studies Review*. Vol. 19, No. 2. pp. 115-136.
- Smith, B. K. (1990). 'Eaters, Food and Social Hierarchy in Ancient India: A Dietary Guide to a Revolution of Values'. *Journal of American Academy of Religion*. Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 179-205.
- Smith, B. K. (1991). 'Classifying Animals and Humans in Ancient India'. *Man*. Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 527-548.
- Smith, B. K. (1994). *Classifying the Universe: The Ancient Indian Varṇa System and the origins of Caste*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sokolov, R. (1975). 'A Plant of ill Repute'. *Natural History*. Vol. 84, No. 3, pp. 70-71.
- Spencer, C. (1993). *A Heretics Feast. A History of Vegetarianism*. London: Fourth Estate.
- Stevenson, R. J. (2009). *The Psychology of Flavour*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stewart, J.J. (2010). 'The Question of Vegetarianism and Diet in Pali Buddhism.' *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 17, pp.100–140.
- Sutherland, G. H. (1991). *The Disguises of the Demon: The Development of the Yakṣa in Hinduism and Buddhism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Suzuki, D. (2000). *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Suzuki, T. (2003). 'The Ban on Meat Eating in the Mahāmegha Sūtra'. *Research Journal of Yamakuch Prefectural college*. Vol. 9, p. 2.
- Takeuchi, Y. (1985). 'The viewpoint of food in Early and Sectarian Buddhism'. *The Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 166-172.
- Takeuchi, Y. (1993). 'The Relationship between Meditative Thought and food in Pali Buddhist Texts'. *Study of Zen Studies*. Vol. 71, pp. 113-147.
- Takeuchi, Y. (1994 A). 'A Comparison of the cultivation of the Contemplation of Repulsiveness in Nutriment between Southern Theravada and the Sarvāstivādin schools'. *Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 23, pp. 37-53.
- Takeuchi, Y. (1994 B). 'Different Aspects of the Contemplation of Repulsiveness in Nutriment'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 127-133.
- Tambiah, S. J. (1976). *World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tambiah, S. J. (1989). 'King Mahāsammata: the First King in the Buddhist Story of Creation and his Persisting Relevance'. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford*. Vol. 20, pp. 101-122.
- Tatia, N. (1971). 'The Jain Ideal of Ahimsa and Its Influence on other Indian Religions and Gandhi's Ahimsa'. *Vaishali Institute Research Bulletin*. pp. 145-160.
- Thanissaro Bhikkhu. (tr.) (2007). *Pācittiya: Rules entailing confession (Bhikkhu Pāṭimokkha The Bhikkhus' Code of Discipline)* Accessed from

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/vin/sv/bhikkhu-pati.html#pc> on 15/5/2015.

- Turner, A. Cox, L. and Bocking, B. (2013). 'A Buddhist Crossroads: Pioneer European Buddhist and Globalizing Asian network 1860-1960.' *Contemporary Buddhism*. Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Thieme, J. and Raja, I. (2009). *Table is laid: The Oxford Anthology of South Asian Food Writing*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ulrich, E. Katherine. (2007). 'Food Fight: Buddhist, Hindu, and Jain Dietary Polemics in South India'. *History of Religions*. Vol. 46, No. 3, pp. 228-61.
- Unschuld, P. U, Tessenow, Hermann and Zheng Jiusheng. (2011). *Huang Di nei Jing su wen: An Annotated Translation of Huang Di's inner classic—Basic Questions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vajirañāna, Parawahera. (1975). *Buddhist Meditation in Theory and Practice: A General Exposition according to the Pali canon of the Theravada School*. Kuala Lumpur: Buddhist Missionary Society.
- Vetter, T. (1988). *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Waldau, P. (2002). *The Specter of Speciesism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, B. C. (1980). *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press.
- Walshe, M. (1995). *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Digha Nikaya*. Massachusetts: Wisdom Publications.
- Walters, Jonathan, S. (1990) 'The Buddha's Bad Karma: A Problem in the History of Theravāda Buddhism.' *Numen*, 37 (1), 70-95
- Wasson, C. G. (1982). 'The Last Meal of the Buddha with Memorandum by Walpola Rahula and Epilogue by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol. 104, No. 4, pp. 591-603.

- Watanabe, K. (1993). 'The Life of Plants'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 41, No.2, pp. 94-100.
- Wayman, A. (1961). *Analysis of the Sravakabhumi*: Manuscript. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Webster, S and Rhiannon de Wreede. (2012). *Embryology at a Glance*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wezler, Albrecht. (1978). *Die wahren 'Speiseresteesser' (Skt. vighasāśin)*. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- Wiltshire, M. G. (1990). *Ascetic Figures before and in Early Buddhism. The Emergence of Gautama as the Buddha*. Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Williams, R. (1963). (reprint. 1998). *Jaina Yoga: a survey of the mediaeval Śrāvakācāras*. Delhi: Morilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Wujastyk, Dominik. (1998). *The Roots of Ayurveda: Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings*. New Delhi: Penguin.
- Yasui, K. (1963). 'Prohibition of Meat-eating in the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*.' *Journal of Otani Studies*. Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 1-13.
- Yifa. (2002). *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Yokuno, M. (1998). 'Jizan and the Realization of Buddha by Grasses and Trees'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 93-96.
- Zimmermann, F. (1987). *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meat: An Ecological Theme in Hindu Medicine*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zydenbos, R. (1999). 'The Ritual Giving of Food to a Digambara Renunciant.' In N. K. Wagle and O. Qvarnastrom. (eds.) *Approaches to Jain Studies*. University of Toronto: Center for South Asian Studies. pp. 291-303.

- Zysk, K. G. (1982). 'Studies in Traditional Indian Medicine in the Pāli Canon: Jivaka and Ayurveda'. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 5, pp. 70-86.
- Zysk, K. G. (1990). 'The Indian Ascetic traditions and the Origins of Ayurvedic medicine'. *Journal of the European Ayurvedic Society*. Vol. 1, pp. 119-124.
- Zysk, K. G. (1993). *Religious Medicine*. London: Transaction Publisher.
- Zysk, K. G. (1996). *Medicine in the Veda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Zysk, K. G. (1998). *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

APPENDIX

DETAILED BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON THE SIX EXTANT VINAYA

1. Theravāda

The Theravāda *vinaya* has older history than others and it is equipped with all components of *vinaya* as a single Buddhist sect. It is reserved in Pali which is one of the oldest forms of Indian languages.

1) language: Pāli

2) Complete text:

A. the monks' and nuns' precept text

First *pāṭimokkha* edition in 1869 by Ivan Minayeff titled 'pāṭimokkha sutra.'

E. J. Thomas summary of the *pāṭimokkha* in his book, *The History of Buddhist Thought*.

J, F. Dickson article, "The *pāṭimokkha*, being the Buddhist office of the Confession of Priests. The Pali text, with a Translation and Notes." In 1876.

In 1939, *pāṭimokkha* published by Bhandarkar Oriental Series edited by R. D. Vadekar.

In 1966, Ñāṇamoli's *pāṭimokkha* Bangkok, 1966.

In 2001, the *pāṭimokkha* edited by William Pruitt and translated by K. R. Norman in PTS.

Ref. Prebish 1994: 46-47.

B. the *Kammavācā* text

First *Kammavācā* titled "Kammavāakya" Liber de officiis sacerdotum buddhicorum was published in 1841.

In 1875, J. F. Dicson published “The Upasampadā-Kammavācā, being the Buddhist Manual of the Form and Manner of Ordering Priests and Deacons.”

In 1883, “Handbook of Pali” by Oscar Frankfurter in London.

In 1892, Baynes published “A Collection of Kammavācās”

In 1894, “A Note on the Buddhist Golden Book exhibited by the President, the Honourable Sir Charles Elliot, KCIE”

In 1906-1907, G. M. Clauson published “A New Kammavācā” in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society*. Ref. Prebish 1994: 48-49.

C. the *vinaya* of the Theravāda

a. *Suttavibhaṅga*

Hemann Oldenberg published Pali *suttavibhaṅga* III (1881) and IV (1882).

In 1958, Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap published Pali *suttavibhaṅga* two volume in Nālandā Devanāgarī Pāli Series. Ref. Prebish 1994: 49.

b. *Skandhaka*

Pali *Khandhaka*, *Mahavagga* (1879) and *Cullavagga* (1880) were published by Oldenberg.

In 1956, *Mahavagga* and *Cullavagga* were published in Nālandā Devanāgarī Pāli Series. Ref. Prebish 1994: 50.

c. Appendices

In 1883, *Parivāra* was published as volume V in the *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ*.

In 1958, *Parivāra* was published as Vol. V in Nālandā Devanāgarī Pāli Series. Ref. Prebish 1994: 52-53.

3) usage: still used in the Theravāda countries such as Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Thai, Khambodia, Laos, part of Vietnam, part of Bangladesh, etc.

4) edition used: The Pali Text Society editions of Pāli and their translations into English: *Suttavibhaṅga*, *Mahavagga*, *Cullavagga* and *Parivāra*. (Also see footnotes for additional translations.)

2. Dharmaguptaka: The *vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka (*Si Fen lu*, 四分律) was translated in 410-412 in Chan-an by Buddhayaśa (*Chu Sanzang Ji Ji*, 出三藏記集, T. LV. p.20b, but there is some controversy about the date of the translation of the *vinaya*, because Chinese literature mentions different dates of translation like 408 or 410-413 etc) and Zhu Fo Nian (竺佛念). Chinese Buddhist Sangha and East Asian Buddhist Sangha live under the regulation of this *vinaya*. This *vinaya* is not translated from Sanskrit texts but from the memory of Buddhayaśa, which is mentioned in the *Chu Sanzang Ji Ji* (出三藏記集, T. LV. p. 20c). Ref. Hirakawa 1999: 138-141. (full reference: Hirakawa Akira. (1999). *A Study of Vinaya*. Tokyo: Shujusha)

1) language: Chinese

2) Complete text: The Chinese version of the Dharmaguptaka is equipped with all *vinaya* components. (Prebish 1994: 70-75.)

The Chinese version of the Dharmaguptaka *vinaya* has

a. the monks' and nuns' precept text

*the *Si fen lu bi qiu jie ben* (四分律比丘戒本, T. XXII. No. 1429)

* the *Si fen seng jie ben* (四分僧戒本, T. XXII. No. 1430)

* the *Si fen bi qiu ni jie ben* (四分比丘尼戒本, T. XXII. No. 1431)

b. the *Karmavācanā* text (T. XXII. NO. 1432)

* the Tan wu de lu bu za jie mo (曇無德部律部雜羯磨, T. XXII. No. 1432)

* the Jie mo (羯磨, T. XXII. No. 1433)

* the Si fen bi qiu ni jie mo fa (四分比丘尼羯磨法, T. XXII. No. 1434)

C. the vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka

a. *Sūtravibhaṅga*

* the Si fen lu(四分律, T. XXII. No. 1428. Vols. 60)

b. *Skandhaka*

* the Si fen lu(四分律, T. XXII. No. 1428. Vols. 60)

c. Appendices

* the Si fen lu(四分律, T. XXII. No. 1428. Vols. 60)

3) Usage: This is the *vinaya* that is still used in China, Japan, Korea and Vietnam.

4) edition used: T. XXII. No. 1428: 四分律 *Sifen lu* (*Dharmaguptaka vinaya*) (tr.) 佛陀耶舍 Fo tuo ye she (Buddhayaśas) and 竺佛念 Zhufonian.

3. Mahīśāsaka: Tr. In 423-424. By Buddhajīva (Fo Tuo Shi, 佛陀什) and Zhu Dao Sheng (竺道生). This *vinaya* was translated from the text which Fa Xian (法顯) obtained from Sri Lanka. Fa Xian died before the translation of the *vinaya*. That is why Buddhajīva translated the text, who learnt Buddhist texts from a Mahīśāsaka monk. (Prebish 1994: 66; Hirakawa 1999: 149)

1) language: Chinese.

2) Complete text: This *vinaya* is complete except the Appendix.

The Chinese version of the Mahīśāsaka *vinaya* has

A. the monks' (T. XXII. No. 1422a and 1422b) and nuns' precept texts (T. XXII. No. 1423)

* the Mi sha sai wu fen jie ben (彌沙塞五分戒本, T. XXII. No. 1422a)

* the Wu fen jie ben (五分戒本, T. XXII. No. 1422b)

* the Wu fen bi qiu ni jie ben (五分比丘尼戒本, T. XXII. No. 1423)

B. the *Karmavācanā* text (T. XXII. NO. 1424)

*the Mi sha sai jie mo ben (彌沙塞羯磨本, T. XXII. No. 1424)

C. the *vinaya* of the Mahīśāsaka (T. XXII. No. 1421. Vols. 34)

a. *sūtravibhaṅga*

* the Mi sha sai bu he xi wu fen lu (彌沙塞部和醯五分律, T. XXII. No. 1421)

b. *skandhaka*

* the Mi sha sai bu he xi wu fen lu (彌沙塞部和醯五分律, T. XXII. No. 1421)

c. No Appendix (Prebish 1994: 66-70.)

3) Usage: There is no living tradition of this *vinaya*

4) Edition used: the edition that I used: T. XXII. No. 1421: 五分律 *Wufen lu* (*Mahīśāsaka vinaya*) (tr.) 佛陀什 Fo tuo shi (Buddhajīva) and 竺道生 Zhu dao sheng.

4. Mahāsāṃghika: tr. In 416-418 (Hirakawa 1999: 144). This *vinaya* was translated into Chinese by Buddhābhadda and Fa Xian. This manuscript of the *vinaya* was found by Fa Xian in Pāṭaliputra. Ref. except for the date of translation of this *vinaya*, the rest of this content is from Prebish 1994: 56-60.

1) **language** in which they are extant: Sanskrit (discovered in China. Hirakawa 1999: p. 68) and Chinese

2) **Complete text:** the extent to which this text is complete:

A. the monks' (T. XXII. No. 1426) and nuns' precept texts (T. XXII. No. 1427)

* the Mo he seng zhi lu da bi qiu jie ben (摩訶僧祇律大比丘戒本, T. XXII. No. 1426)

* the Mo he seng zhi bi qiu ni jie ben (摩訶僧祇比丘尼戒本, T. XXII. No. 1427)

B. No *Karmavācanā* text

C. the *vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghika (T. XXII. No. 1425. Vols. 40)

a. *sūtravibhaṅga*

* the Mo he seng zhi lu (摩訶僧祇律, T. XXII. No. 1425)

b. *Skandhaka*

* the Mo he seng zhi lu (摩訶僧祇律, T. XXII. No. 1425)

c. No Appendix (Prebish 1994: 56-60).

This *vinaya* lost its the *Karmavācanā* text and the appendix.

3) **Usage:** There is no living tradition of this *vinaya*.

4) **edition used:** T. XXII. No. 1425: 摩訶僧祇律 *Mohesengqu lu* (Mahāsāṃghika *vinaya*)

(tr.) 佛陀跋陀 Fo tuo ba tuo (Buddhabhadra) and Faxian 法顯.

5. Sarvāstivāda: tr. In 404-409. This *vinaya* has unusual number of translators. It

has three translators:

Vol. 1 of this text: translators are Puṇyatrāta and Kumārajīva.

Vol. 2-Vol. 40: Puṇyatrāta

Vol. 41-Vol. 49: Puṇyatrāta and Kumārajīva.

Vol. 50-Vol. 59: Puṇyatrāta

Vol. 60-Vol. 61: Vimalākṣa

According to the Biography of Prominent Monks (高僧傳, T. L. p. 333a), to translate this *vinaya*, Puṇyatrāta recited the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya* and Kumārajīva translated it, but when the translation was done by two thirds, Puṇyatrāta was ill.

The Biography of Prominent Monks (高僧傳, T. L. p. 333b) says that in autumn of 405, Dharmaruci participated in the translation. Vimalākṣa arrived in China in 406 and participated in this translation work (高僧傳, T. L. p. 333c). (Hirakawa 1999: 127-130).

1) Language: Extant in Sanskrit and Chinese

2) Complete text: the extent to which they are complete:

The Chinese version of the Sarvāstivāda has

A. the monks' and nun's precept text

*the Shi Song bi qui bo Luo ti mu cha jie ben (十誦比丘波羅提木叉戒本, T. XXIII. No. 1436)

*the Shi Song bi qui ni bo Luo ti mu cha jie ben (十誦比丘尼波羅提木叉戒本, T. XXIII. No. 1437)

There are Sanskrit fragments of the *Pratimokṣa* in Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*

- (1). “extract from the *Prātidēsaniya dharma* section” in ‘Un Fragment Tokharian du Vinaya des Sarvāstivādins’ in *Journal Asiatique* Serie X, Tome XIX, pp. 101-111. in 1912 by Sylvain Levi.
- (2). “Tokharian *pratimokṣa* Fragment” in the *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*. pp. 109-120. in 1913 by Sylvain Levi.
- (3) “Nouveaux Fragments d’un *śikṣas*” in the *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*. pp. 843-846 in 1913 by Louis de La Vallee Poussin.
- (4) “Le *prātimokṣa* des Sarvāstivādins. Texte Sansrit par L. Finot, avec la version chinoise de Kumārajīva traduite en Fancaise par Edouard Huber” in *Journal Asiatique*, Serie XI, Tome II (Dec, 1913), pp. 465-557.
- (5) “Bruchstücke des *Bhikṣuṇī- prātimokṣa* des Sarvāstivādins” (Vol. III. of *Kleinere Sansrit Texts* (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländischen Gesellschaft in kommission bei F.A. Brockhaus. 1926) by Ernst Waldschmidt.
- (6) “Der Schlussteil des *prātimokṣasūtra* der Sarvāstivādins”, Volume XIII of *Sanskrittexte au den Turfanfunden* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) in 1989 by Klaus T. Schmidt. Ref Plebish 1994: 77.

B. the *Karmavācanā* text

There two Chinese versions of this text.

*the *Da Shamen Baiyi Jie Mo Fa* (大沙門百一羯磨法, T. XXIII. No. 1438.)

*the *Shi Song Jie Mo Bi Qiu Yao Yong* (十誦羯磨比丘要用, T. XXIII. No. 1439.)

There are Sanskrit *Karmavācanā* fragments of the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*

- (1) “Fragment of a Buddhist Ordination-Ritual in Sanskrit in Festschrift Hendrik Kern (1903) by Cecil Bendall
- (2) “Nouveaux Fragments de la collection stein.” In this, the follows are included:
 1. Fragments de Tun-huang

2. Fragment d'un kammavācaṃ” in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 843-855. in 1913 by Louis de La vallee Poussin.
- (3) “A fragment of the Sanskrit Vinaya *Bhikṣuṇī Karmavācanā*” in the *Bulletin of the school of Oriental and African Studies*, I, 3(1920), pp. 123-143.
- (4) Vol III of *Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden* (Berlin: Deutsche Akademie de Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung. In 1956 by Herbert Härtel. Ref. Plebish 1994: 78.

C. the *vinaya* of the Sarvāstivāda

a. *sūtravibhaṅga*

* the Shi Song Lu (十誦律, T. XXIII. No. 1435)

There are many Sanskrit fragments in the *sūtravibhaṅga* from the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*.

- (1) “Fragments du vinaya de Sarvāstivādin” in *Journal Asiatique*, Tome CCXXX (Janvier-Mars, 1938), pp. 21-64 in 1938 by Jean Filliozat and Hōryū Kuno (edit)
- (2) “Der Vinayavibhanga zum *Bhikṣu-prātimokṣa* der Sarvāstivādin”, Volume II of *Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden*. In 1959 by valentina Rosen. (Berlin: Deutsche, Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Institut für Orientforschung. 1959).
- (3) “Three Sanskrit Fragment of the vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin”, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 31,1 (January,1988), pp. 11-16 by Jan W, de Jong.—Ref. Plebish 1994: 79-80.

b. *Skandhaka*

*the Shi Song Lu (十誦律, T. XXIII. No. 1435)

There are two Sanskrit *Skandhaka* of Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*.

- (1) “Reste von Devadatta-Episoden aus dem Vinaya der Sarvastivadins” in *zeitschrift der deutschen morgenlandischen Geselllschaft*, 113 (1963), pp. 552-558. By Ernst Waldschmidt.

(2) “Fragment du Vinaya Sanskrit,” in *Journal Asiatique*, Serie X, Tome XVIII
(Novembre-Decembre, 1911) by Lous Finot. Ref. Plebish 1994: 80.

c. Appendices

**the Shi Song Lu (十誦律, T. XXIII. No. 1435)

This *vinaya* is complete. (Prebish 1994: 76-83)

3) **Usage:** no living tradition.

4) **edition used:**

No. 1435: 十誦律 *Shisong lu* (*Sarvāstivāda vinaya*) (tr.) 弗若多羅 Fo ruo duo luo
(Punyatara).

6. Mūlasarvāstivāda

A perfect version of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *vinaya* is translation by Tibetan. There are other two versions of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*, Chinese and Sanskrit, but they have some loss of the components of the *vinaya*. This *vinaya* is the most voluminous one among the many *vinaya*. I shall focus on mentioning Chinese translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*, which I used for this thesis with brief remarks on other two, Sanskrit and Tibetan. Well known Chinese translator of this *vinaya* is I-Ching (義淨) and the time of his translation spanned 18 years, from 695 to 713. He translated many *vinaya* texts ((Hirakawa 1999: 154).

Tibetan version of Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* was translated in the 9th CE by Sarvajnadeva, Jinamitra, Vidyakaraprabha, Dharmakara, Klu'i rgyalmtshan, Dpal-gyi Ihun-Po, and Dpal-brtsegs (Prebish 1994: 84-85).

The Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya* has a different structure from other *vinayas*. It consists of the parts as follows:

- A. *Vinayavastu*
- B. *Bhikṣu Prātimokṣa Sūtra*
- C. *Bhikṣu vinayavibhaṅga*
- D. *Bhikṣuni Prātimokṣa Sūtra*
- E. *Bhikṣunī vinayavibhaṅga*
- F. *Vinaya Kṣudrakavastu*
- G. *Vinaya Uttaragrantha*. (Prebish 1994: 85-86)

1) **language** in which they are extant: Tibetan, Sanskrit and Chinese

2) **complete text**: the extent to which they are complete:

a. the monks' and nuns' precept text

* the Gen ben shuo yi qie you bu jie jing (根本說一切有部戒經. T. XXIV. No.1454)

* the Gen ben shuo yi qie you bu bi chu ni jie jing (根本說一切有部 苾芻尼戒經.
T.XXIV. No. 1455)

* the Tibetan versions of *Prātimokṣa Sūtra* for monks and nuns which have 5 versions
for monks and nuns respectively:

(1) Peking edition

(2) Tōhoku edition

(3) Taipei edition

(4) Snar-thang edition

(5) Co-ne edition

b. the *Karmavācanā* text

There are the *Karmavācanā* texts in Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan associated with this school. Cecil Bendall, Anukul Chandra and Oskar von Hinüber edited the Sanskrit texts of the *Karmavācanā* text of this school. There is a Chinese text of the

Karmavācanā text in this school: *the Gen ben shuo yi qie you bu baiyi jie mo (根本說一切有部百一羯磨. T. XXIV. No. 1453)

There is also a Tibetan text of the *Karmavācanā* text, Las brgya-rtsa-gcig-pa (*Ekottarakarmasataka*).—Ref. Prebish 1994: 88-89.

C. the vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda (T. XXII. No. 1428. Vols. 60)

a. *Vinayavastu*

There are Sanskrit texts of the *Vinayavastu* in the Mūlasarvāstivāda which were edited or translated by Nalinaksha Dutt, Claus Vogel and Raniero Gnoli. There 8 texts of the *Vinayavastu* in Chinese version for this school: T. XXIV. No. 1444, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1448, 1449, 1450 and 1457. Tibetan *Vinayavastu*, ‘Dul-ba gzhi’ was translated into Tibetan by Sarvajñādeva and located in the following Tibetan Tripiṭaka:

* Peking edition, Tōhoku edition, Taipei edition, Snar-thang edition and Co-ne edition.
Ref. Prebish 1994: 89-92.

b. *Vinayavibhaṅga*

There are Sanskrit and Chinese texts for the *Vinayavibhaṅga* in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*. The Chinese version of monks’ and nuns’ *Vinayavibhaṅga* texts are located in T. XXIII. No. 1442 for monks and No. 1443 for nuns.

There are Tibetan texts of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* in this school: monks’ text, ‘Dul-ba rnam-par ‘byed-pa’ translated by Jinamitra and Klui rgyal – mtshan; nuns’ text, ‘Dge-slong-ma’I ‘dul-ba rnam-par ‘byed-pa’ by Sarvajñādeva, Dharmakar, Vidyākaraprabha and Dpal-gyi lhun-po. Ref. Prebish 1994: 96.

c. *Vinaya Kṣudrakavastu*

No Sanskrit texts exists of this. Chinese version of this is The Gen ben shuo yi qie you be pi nai ye za shi (根本說一切有部毗奈耶雜事, T. XXIV. No. 1451). Tibetan version of this text, ‘Dul-ba phran-tshegs-kyi gzhi’ translated by Vidyākaraprabha, Dharmasrīprabha and Dpal-‘byor. (Prebish 1994: 97).

d. *Vinaya Uttaragrantha*

There are no Sanskrit and Chinese texts of this. There are two Tibetan texts for this: one is ‘*Dul-ba gzhung bla-ma*’ and the other is ‘*Dul-ba gzhun dam-pa.*’ (Prebish 1994: 97).

3) Usage: still used in Central Asian Buddhism: Tibet, Mongolia, Bhutan, a part of Nepal, North-Western part of India, etc.

4) edition used: T No. 1442: 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* (*Mūlasarvāstivādin vinaya*) (tr.) 義淨 Yijing.